

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

CARL BECKER
EDWARD P. CHEYNEY
EPHRAIM EMERTON

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON
JAMES H. ROBINSON
CLAUDE H. VAN TYNE

MANAGING EDITOR

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOLUME XXI

OCTOBER 1915 TO JULY 1916

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

1916

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

The
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION IN CALIFORNIA

FOR several years, indeed during most of the period since the establishment of the Pacific Coast Branch in 1903, the members of that branch urgently invited the American Historical Association to hold one of its regular meetings somewhere upon the Pacific Slope. Great as were the attractions, the difficulties, especially in the case of meetings held at Christmas time, seemed insurmountable. Accordingly the Pacific Coast members, three years ago, took advantage of the approach of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to invite the Association to hold an additional or intercalary meeting in California in the summer of 1915. The invitation was gratefully accepted. Mr. Rudolph J. Taussig, president of the Academy of Pacific Coast History and secretary of the exposition, was made chairman of the committee of arrangements, Professor E. D. Adams of Stanford University (whose place was later taken by Professor Frederic L. Thompson of Amherst College, temporarily resident at Berkeley), chairman of the committee on programme. The date set was July 20-23. Officials of the University of California, of Stanford University, and of other Californian institutions, co-operated heartily with those named, in making the meeting successful; but no doubt all who labored for its success would unite in declaring that it owed more of its form, merit, and interest to the endeavors of Professor H. Morse Stephens, of the University of California, president of the American Historical Association, than to those of any other individual.

Those who remember the meeting of July, 1893, held at Chicago during the time of the World's Fair, will not need to be told that a meeting held under such circumstances cannot be expected to have the same character as one that might be held in cloistered seclusion at some tranquil time and place. It was difficult for audiences to be prompt, difficult sometimes for them to resist the surrounding

attractions of the exposition. The programme was broken, a little more largely than is usual, by defaults and alterations. Circumstances required the exercises to be held in too many different places—the Philippine Islands Building, the Oregon Building, the California Building, the Argentine Building, at the exposition, the Fairmont Hotel and the hall of the Native Sons of the Golden West in San Francisco, the buildings of the University of California at Berkeley, those of Stanford University at Palo Alto—places, in some instances, separated from each other by long suburban or urban journeys.

But on the other hand there were compensations, more than ample, for all these minor and inevitable infelicities. No one had expected or desired the occasion to reproduce in full detail the typical meeting of the Association, and all attempt to do so was frankly abandoned. There was no business session, nor any attempt to transact business. The attendance (registration about 150) was mainly of members dwelling in the western half of the United States, though with a fair sprinkling of eastern members. The programme made no effort to cover the whole field of human history, but, with excellent judgment, substituted for the usual miscellany a body of papers all having the common trait of relating to the Pacific Ocean or to Panama. This appropriate limitation gave unity to the whole occasion, and the exceptional interest which resulted from it was one of the distinguishing marks of the California meeting.

Other distinguishing characteristics were supplied by the local environment and by the resident friends of the Association. It was difficult to take other than a hopeful view of the status and progress of history, in the sparkling air and under the bright sky of California, in sight of the Audacious Archer and the other artistic triumphs of the exposition, under the live-oaks of the Berkeley campus, or in the impressive cloisters of Palo Alto. The great war, which in the East oppresses the heart with incessant pain, was visibly three thousand miles farther away. The local members of the Association welcomed all comers with Californian openness of hand and mind. The general receptions at the California Building, at the house of President Wheeler, and at the hall of the Native Sons, the luncheons at the two universities, the afternoon hour at the beautiful country house of Mr. and Mrs. Crocker, and on the final day the hours of exquisite pleasure spent under the hospitable roof of Mrs. Hearst at her hacienda at Pleasanton, made a sum total of social pleasure which can hardly have been equalled at any previous

meeting, and which certainly could never be paralleled at any meeting held in the East in December.

By association with the meetings of the American Asiatic Association and of the Asiatic Institute, the meeting was made a part of a Panama-Pacific Historical Congress; but the present report is confined to the proceedings of the Historical Association. Those of the two organizations which preceded were not in the strict sense historical, though they dealt with themes which have great interest for every historian; for instance, the proceedings of the Asiatic Institute consisted of discussions of "The Pacific as the Theatre of Two Civilizations" and "The Pacific as the Theatre of 'the World's great Hereafter'", by ex-Secretary Bryan, ex-President Taft, Chancellor Jordan, and others. Even in the case of the papers read before the Historical Association, the fullest sort of summary is rendered less necessary, and the defects naturally attending one auditor's report will be made less of an evil, by the fact that a volume commemorative of the occasion and containing the full text of most of these papers is expected to be published before long. It will certainly be a notable volume, for the papers, besides the unity of theme and effect which has been spoken of above, were in general of marked excellence.

Four general papers of distinguished value marked the evening sessions: the address of Professor Stephens, president of the Association, on the Conflict of European Nations in the Pacific Ocean; that of Señor Don Rafael Altamira y Crevea, professor at Madrid, and representative of the Spanish government on this occasion, on Spain and the Pacific Ocean; that of Hon. John F. Davis, president of the Native Sons of the Golden West, on the History of California, and that of Mr. Taussig on "The American Interoceanic Canal; an Historical Sketch of the Canal Idea". At the conclusion of Mr. Taussig's clear and valuable review of the long process by which the great historic event now being celebrated had been brought about, Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, an ex-president of the Association, being called upon by the president gave an extended and most interesting narrative of the course of action through which, as president of the United States, he had secured to it the opportunity to construct a Panama Canal under purely American control; his speech gave to the programme a dramatic conclusion not foreseen.

The main purpose of Professor Stephens's presidential address was to show how the development of efforts for the control of the Pacific had followed the course of European politics. This was done with a characteristically wide view over the fields of modern

European history. Regular communication, it was pointed out, and systematic exploration and development, and all the problems of the Pacific, begin with the first advent of the Europeans, with the arrival of the Portuguese at Malacca in 1509 and in China, and with the simultaneous Spanish discoveries of Balboa. The first great landmarks are the expedition of Magellan and the Spanish occupation of the Philippines, begun in 1565, the latter an event of capital importance, which the institution of the Manila galleon connected closely with the history of Mexico. Another stage was marked by the absorption of Portugal into Spain in 1580. The English and Dutch resistance to the Hapsburg power is reflected in Drake's voyage and in other events, but the commercial endeavors of those powers were turned rather toward India, eastern Asia, and the Malay Archipelago, from which however the Dutch developed the earlier explorations of the South Pacific. The Spanish monopoly in the Pacific, assailed by the English and Dutch in the early seventeenth century, and under Louis XIV. by those French attacks which Dahlgren has recently described, was revived after the treaty of Utrecht, but once more assailed by the English in their struggle against exclusion from Spanish America, culminating in the war of 1740. Anson's incursion into the Pacific and capture of the Manila galleon marked a fresh era, showing that the Spanish power in the Pacific was vulnerable, that that ocean need no longer be regarded as a Spanish lake. English statesmen began to cast their eyes upon it. Draper's occupation of Manila in 1762 was a preliminary sign. From the time of Peter the Great the monopoly began to be threatened by Russia. Spain answered by renewed efforts, northward from New Spain, westward from Peru. The *legajo* in the Archives of the Indies which relates to the Portolá expedition is entitled "Papers relating to the Russians in California". But the answer came too late, and the Nootka Sound convention of 1790, ending Spanish monopoly, ended an epoch in the history of the Pacific. Already the first real trade across the Pacific—in furs from the Northwest Coast to China—had been begun; but the suspension of European activity of this sort from 1789 to 1815 gave the United States the chance to supplant Europe in the trade. In a similar manner, the effects of Spanish American independence, of the American acquisition of California, of the foundation of British Columbia and the confederation of Canada, of the rise of Japan and Australia, and of the war of 1898, were sketched in their large outlines, the problem of the conflicts between America and Asiatic powers remaining as the chief problem of the twentieth century.

Of the sessions occupied, after the manner of such meetings, with groups of briefer papers, five were devoted to five different aspects or subdivisions of the main theme of the congress. Thus, one session, a session held jointly with the two Asiatic societies, was given to the Philippine Islands and their History, as a part of the history of the Pacific Ocean area; one to the Northwestern States, British Columbia, and Alaska in their relation with the Pacific Ocean; one to Spanish America and the Pacific; one to the Exploration of the Northern Pacific Ocean and the Settlement of California; and one to Japan and Australasia. There was also a meeting of the California History Teachers' Association, and a meeting devoted to the history of New Mexico and styled a meeting of the New Mexico Historical Society, though open to the same public as the other sessions. In the former the question was discussed, by Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University, Miss Crystal Harford of the Lodi High School, Mr. Edward J. Berringer of the Sacramento High School, and Mr. John R. Sutton of the Oakland High School, whether it is for the interest of history in schools that the American Historical Association make a fuller definition of the history requirement for entrance to college, a definition showing the especial points to be emphasized and those to be more lightly treated.

The session relating to Philippine History was presided over by Professor León María Guerrero, of the University of Manila, who introduced the session by remarks on the moral mission of history and on the special difficulties of the history of the Philippine Islands. In the absence of Dr. James A. Robertson, librarian of the Philippine Library, a summary was given, by another hand, of a paper in which he had set forth a remarkable discovery lately made by him, on the island of Panay, of a Bisayan criminal code in a syllabic script, which casts much novel light on the social structure of the early Philippine peoples and on their ideas of law in the period before the Spanish occupation.

Of the papers actually read in the session, the first, by Mr. K. C. Leebrick, of the University of California, dealt with the Troubles of an English Governor of the Philippines, namely, those of Dawsonne Drake, a simple-minded East India Company servant, of narrow training, sent out from Madras after the conquest of Manila, installed as deputy governor in November, 1762, and forced by his council to resign in March, 1764. The story was told from the Manila Records in the archives of Madras, and from papers in the Public Record Office and the British Museum. The difficulties were those naturally engendered by placing the officers of a mili-

tary and naval expedition under the direction of a commercial company, but heightened by conciliar organization, by the confusion of military and financial purposes, and by dissensions of religion and race among English, Spanish, native, and Chinese elements.

The paper by Dr. Charles H. Cunningham, of the same university, on the Question of Ecclesiastical Visitation in the Philippines, dealt with a long series of disputes arising from the exceptional arrangement whereby in these islands benefices were largely held by members of the regular clergy. The practice of episcopal visitation placed such holders of benefices in a position of divided allegiance, as between their prelates and their orders, and led to long-continued discord. Some of the earlier archbishops were regulars, ambitious for their orders; later, the archbishop usually acted under a natural ambition to control all ecclesiastical affairs. In these disputes of prelates and friars, the audiencia acted both as a tribunal and as agent of the royal power. But in the end the supplanting of the friars by seculars was generally conceded to be inadvisable, because its tendency would be to bring into the benefices immature and undesirable native priests.

Dr. David P. Barrows, dean in the University of California, and formerly commissioner of education in the Philippine Islands, gave a mere summary of his paper on the Governor General of the Philippines under Spain and the United States. The dilemma in the shaping of the office was, as he described it, that of investing the supreme administrative official with ample authority for meeting all emergencies, at so great a distance from the metropolitan country, yet guarding against excessive power. The purport of his paper was to describe the extent to which the traditions of this same great office as it existed under Spain had survived into the present régime.

The session for Northwestern-Pacific history was opened by a paper by Hon. F. W. Howay of New Westminster, judge in British Columbia, on the Fur Trade as a Factor in Northwestern Development. After dwelling upon the transitory character, wasteful competition, and slight results of the period of maritime endeavor from 1788 to 1815, he turned to description of the greater results which followed the fur trade, especially after the union of the Northwest Company with the Hudson's Bay Company. Despite the purpose of avoiding improvements not strictly necessary to subsistence and the trade, the Company was insensibly led to develop the country in ways that would bring forward agriculture and commerce, the lumber and coal industries.

From extensive studies in the Russian archives, made on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Professor Frank A. Golder, of Washington State College, in an address of much interest, developed the Attitude of the Russian Government toward its American Possessions. The beginning was made by the expeditions of Peter the Great. Catherine II. uniformly vetoed proposals of Russian expansion into America, on the ground that such undertakings called for a greater marine and a more abundant population than Russia possessed, and also would detract from the development of Siberia. Mr. Golder described the discussions under the Czar Paul, the chartering of the Russian America Company, the renewed discussions when its first charter expired, and the increasing burden which Russian America appeared, from 1820 to 1860, to lay on the Russian government, until, after an unfavorable report from two commissioners sent out in 1861-1862, Russia was quite ready to give up the territory for much less than she obtained by the treaty of 1867. The reasons given by Stoeckl, minister at Washington, in a confidential report to the Minister of Finance, were summarized: the general unprofitableness of European colonies, the difficulty of holding that great region in case of war, the great burden of expense to be borne till a remote period, the precariousness of trade as the United States expanded, "manifest destiny", and the stronger claims of the career that lay before the Russians in Asia.

Hon. Clarence B. Bagley of Seattle, in a paper on the Waterways of the Pacific Northwest, dwelt chiefly upon the development of steamboat navigation, especially that of navigation on the Columbia River till its recent opening up to Lewiston, upon the harbor improvements by government and capitalists at Seattle and Vancouver, and upon the recent history of northwestern commerce.

The final paper in this session was a thoughtful and suggestive discourse by its chairman, Professor Joseph Schafer of the University of Oregon, on the Western Ocean as a Determinant in Oregon History. Adverting first to the large place which water communication with the Pacific, for purposes primarily of Asiatic trade, had had in Jefferson's instructions to Lewis and Clark and earlier explorers, he showed how nevertheless the Willamette colony had till 1849 been isolated from the rest of the world almost as completely as early Virginia or Massachusetts. Development out of the pioneer stage would probably have been much slower but for external accidents like the discovery of gold in California and in British Columbia. Enthusiastic faith in a Pacific future, such as is expressed in Wilkes's prophetic words regarding the relations of Oregon and California to the Pacific Ocean, or such as is shown

in those thoughts of Asiatic trade that inspired the earliest projects of transcontinental railroads, caused the region to be settled before its time. Its social state advanced more rapidly than that of the Mississippi Valley because of its openness to the sea.

In the session expected to be devoted to Spanish America and the Pacific Ocean it so happened that the programme actually carried out consisted of three papers in Mexican history. Professor Herbert E. Bolton, of the University of California, described the life and the tireless missionary labors of Father Eusebio Kino, basing his narrative on the elaborate account by the father himself, *Favores Celestiales*, the manuscript of which Professor Bolton had discovered in Mexico. Kino's fifty *entradas* and missionary endeavors in Pimería Alta (southern Arizona and northern Sonora, 1687-1711), his foundation of Nuestra Señora de los Dolores and other missions, and the cartographical and industrial results of his labors, were well described.

Mr. Herbert J. Priestley, of the same university, presented a valuable paper upon the important subject of the Reforms of Joseph Gálvez in New Spain, where he spent the years 1769-1775 as the last *visitador general*. The speaker described the character of Gálvez, energetic, independent, vindictive, his instructions from Arriaga, and the financial abuses, of complication, looseness, speculation, which he was expected to correct. His reforms, supported by the Marqués de la Croix, and followed up by Bucareli and Revilagigedo, his creation of the Provincias Internas, his establishment of the intendency system, greatly increased the royal revenues; but his efforts were confined to economic reform, when social and judicial reforms were also sadly needed.

A paper by the chairman of the session, Professor William R. Manning, of the University of Texas, on British Influence in Mexico and Poinsett's Struggle against it, brought this session to its conclusion. The paper, which rested on archival research in both Washington and Mexico, narrated the quasi-diplomatic efforts made by Canning in 1822 and 1823 through confidential agents preceding the appointment of Michelena as minister to Great Britain, the definite resolve of that country to recognize Mexican independence, the arrival of Poinsett, and his efforts to counteract the coolness of the Mexicans toward the United States and the ascendancy of the British representatives.

The first of the papers in Californian history, in a session held at Berkeley, was a paper of personal reminiscence, by its chairman, Hon. Horace Davis, on the Home League of 1861, an organization

of California Union men formed to bring together Republicans and Democrats in support of the Union and of President Lincoln's administration. Its work consisted in conducting propaganda, organizing a Home Guard, promoting enlistment, keeping down conspiracy, and especially in striving to elect a war governor (Stanford) who would support Lincoln. After Stanford's election, those who sympathized with the Confederacy largely left the state, to share the Confederate fortunes.

Next, Father Zephyrin Engelhardt, O. F. M., of Santa Barbara, the historian of the Franciscan missions of California, gave a brief and informal description of the order, of the general objects of its work in California, of its difficulties, of the methods of establishing and maintaining its sixteen missions, and of the process of their suppression.

In a paper on the Northern Limits of Drake's Voyage, Mrs. Zelia Nuttall, whose recent Hakluyt Society volume of new Drake documents will be remembered, established careful comparisons between noteworthy maps covering his Pacific voyage—the Hakluyt copy (Paris, 1584) of Drake's great map, made for Henry of Navarre, the Dutch-French map of 1586 in the New York Public Library, a second Dutch map corrected by Drake himself, and Hondius's map and text of 1596, which Hakluyt took over from the Dutch into the 1598 edition of his *Voyages*, the only narrative he gives which tells the story of New Albion.

The last paper of this session was one by Professor William D. Armes, of the University of California, on the Bear Flag War.

In the New Mexican session, which also took place at Berkeley, Hon. Bradford L. Prince, ex-governor of New Mexico, and president of the New Mexico Historical Society, described its work and collections, and marked the occasion, considered as a meeting of the society, by presenting the diploma of honorary membership to Professor Bolton and to Mr. Charles W. Hackett, of the University of California. Mr. Bolton then read a paper entitled *New Light on the Explorations of Juan de Oñate*. After reviewing the sources already familiar, for the most part already in print in the *Colección de Documentos*, he showed that documents of similar class and of equal value lay unprinted in the Archives of the Indies at Seville. Of several of these, transcripts are now available at Berkeley, including Oñate's own narrative of his journey of 1601, which, it seems, extended to the regions of southern Kansas (Wichita).

The chairman of the session, Professor Aurelio M. Espinosa, of

Stanford University, then called upon Professor Altamira, who spoke in Spanish, with great eloquence, upon the responsibilities, political and moral, of the historian.

Under the title, *New Light on the American Fur Trade in the Southwest*, Professor Thomas M. Marshall, of Stanford University, described, from *expedientes* found in Sonora and in the City of Mexico, the fur-seeking expedition of Cyril St. Vrain to the Gila River in 1826. Of such expeditions in that region there is little record. They were illicit and largely surreptitious. Gregg did not engage in trade over the Santa Fé trail till 1831, and knew little beyond that later trade in merchandise of which his book gives the classical account. St. Vrain's large expedition, which went into Sonora, mostly for beaver, was the subject of local protest, and of remonstrance to Poinsett.

The last paper of the session was one by Mr. Charles W. Hackett, on the Causes of the Failure of Otermín's Attempt to reconquer New Mexico, based on new materials obtained from Mexico and Spain, from the Bancroft Library and the Peabody Museum. The causes were simply the superiority of numbers on the Indian side, and the want of confidence in success on the part of the Spaniards.

The session concerned with Japan and Australasia was held at Palo Alto, Chancellor Jordan presiding. It was marked by two papers of capital interest, one by Dr. Naojiro Murakami, president of the Tokyo School of Foreign Languages and representative of the Japanese government, and the other by Professor K. Asakawa of Yale University. Dr. Murakami's subject was the Early Relations between Japan and Mexico; his paper was based on personal researches in Seville as well as in Japan. The relations described grew out of commerce with the Philippines, from which annual ships began to come to Japan in 1608. The next year the beaching on the Japanese coast of the *San Francisco*, en route from Cavite to Acapulco, gave Iyeyasu the occasion for beginning relations with Mexico. The sailing of the first Japanese merchant in 1610, on the *San Buenaventura*, built in Japan by William Adams, had its response in Vizcaino's voyage of exploration to Japan in 1611. Macao and the Jesuits opposed the Philippine-Japanese trade, the Franciscans favored it; the audiencia of the Philippines, on the other hand, opposed the trade between Mexico and Japan. Dr. Murakami described the voyage of the Japanese envoy sent by Masamune in 1613 to the viceroy of Mexico, his progress on to Spain and Rome, his return by way of the Philippines, his arrival in Japan

in 1620; and narrated the course of events which made this trans-Pacific intercourse so short-lived.

Professor Asakawa's paper took the audience back into an earlier period of Japanese history, dealing with Japan's Early Experience with Buddhism. He described with much skill the stages through which Buddhism passed in the first seven centuries after its introduction into Japan: at first, much beyond the mental range of the average votary, emphasizing the moral conduct of the individual and used to promote welfare in a non-spiritual sense; then (ninth to twelfth century) turning at the Kyoto court toward the founding of temples and monasteries and thus toward ritualism, but pursued with better understanding of Buddhist doctrine, until the Kyoto literature was pervaded with it; then the new plan of salvation, after the grave, called Zhodo; then, as feudalism increased and the military class came into domination, reaching in the thirteenth century the form called Zen, suited to the needs of such a caste and calling for extreme concentration of mind, energy, and boldness.

For a fuller knowledge of the papers thus briefly summarized, recourse must be had to the forthcoming volume, already mentioned. But even these insufficient outlines may serve to show how copious and vivid was the interest of the occasion to those who were so fortunate as to attend, and how abundantly the project of holding a meeting of the Association on the Pacific Coast was justified by its execution.

J. F. J.

MAXIMUM WAGE-LAWS FOR PRIESTS AFTER THE BLACK DEATH, 1348-1381¹

FROM lists of ordinations and of institutions to benefices,² it has been calculated that about 5000 of the beneficed clergy in England died in the great plague—half of the total number;³ if the proportion of beneficed to unbeneficed clergy (including the regulars under the latter head) is reckoned as about one to four, the number of deaths among the whole body of clergy would be, roughly speaking, 25,000.⁴ The estimate of 2,500,000, or half the existing population, as the mortality for the whole nation,⁵ depends on the assumption that the proportion of clergy to laity is one to a hundred⁶ and that the death-rate is the same for both estates,⁷ including in each case a larger number of poor than of rich.⁸ That there was practically no recovery in numbers by the time of the Great Revolt is due in part at least to the serious outbreaks of pestilence during the intervening years, the plagues of 1361, 1368-1369, and 1375 being especially severe.⁹

Whatever divergence there may be in the views held by modern

¹ A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, December 29, 1914.

² They are preserved in the Episcopal Registers and on the Patent Rolls and together with the figures in monastic chronicles are the only precise data thus far analyzed for the mortality in England: Capes, *History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, p. 74. The pioneer work in the analysis of these lists was performed years ago by Jessopp for East Anglia in *The Coming of the Friars and other Historic Essays* and has since been confirmed by the wider researches of Gasquet in *The Great Pestilence*, lately republished as *The Black Death*, and also by the investigations of the contributors to the *Victoria County History*. No calculations can be considered as final, however, until there have been statistical studies of the great mass of secular records now available, such as manorial court-rolls, inquisitions post mortem, etc.

³ Gasquet, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87, 156, 181, 203, foot-note, 236-237. For other calculations, cf. Jessopp, quoted by Gasquet, p. 87; Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England*, pp. 389-390; Capes, 265; Stubbs, *Constitutional History* (fifth ed.), III. 379, 384.

⁵ For the controversy on this point, see Putnam, *Enforcement of the Statutes of Labourers*, p. 2, note 1, and Gasquet, pp. 225-227, 237-238.

⁶ Gasquet, *ubi supra*; for other estimates, see *ibid.*, pp. 192, 238; Cutts, p. 390; Capes, p. 258.

⁷ Gasquet, pp. 86, 192, 237.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 227; Creighton, *History of Epidemics*, I. 124.

⁹ Gasquet, pp. 225-226; Creighton, I. 203, 215-217.

scholars as to the permanent effects of the Black Death on the life of the English people,¹⁰ there is a consensus of opinion that its immediate effect was an appalling scarcity of manual laborers, with a consequent rise in wages, and an equally appalling scarcity of priests. On the first point I do not need to dwell;¹¹ on the second, I wish merely to refer to the fairly overwhelming evidence contained in ecclesiastical sources, such as episcopal and papal registers;¹² there are often no priests to perform divine services, to chant masses, or to administer the sacraments.¹³ To meet the grave situation, plenary indulgence was granted by the pope to all who died in the true faith,¹⁴ confession to laymen, even to women, was permitted, and it was said that if no priest could be found for the rite of extreme unction "faith must suffice".¹⁵ Innumerable dispensations were issued sanctioning the ordination of candidates who did not possess the usual qualifications of age, of legitimate and free birth, of education, etc.¹⁶ The demoralization of the church was inevitable and has often been described;¹⁷ here I am concerned with but a narrow phase of the whole situation, namely the effect of the plague on the unbeneficed, secular clergy, who received their incomes in the form of a fixed stipend, usually by the year.

Unbeneficed, stipendiary priests¹⁸ may be parish chaplains, with

¹⁰ The opinions range all the way from the view that every change occurring during the next two centuries is due to the plague to the more fashionable modern theory that denies any lasting effect to a cataclysm. Stubbs, *op. cit.* (fourth ed.), II. 419; Gasquet, pp. xxi-xxiii, 227-236, 251-253; Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (fifth ed.), I. 370-379; Rogers, *History of Agriculture and Prices*, I. 8, 10, 60, 261-267, 292.

¹¹ For references to contemporary and modern views, see Putnam, p. 2.

¹² Of the chroniclers, Knighton gives the fullest description (Rolls Series), II. 63; cf. also Tait's edition of *Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis*, pp. 109-110, 193.

¹³ Gasquet, pp. 118-119, 121, 171, 178; Capes, p. 75.

¹⁴ Gasquet, p. 127.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 92-95, quoted from the register of the Bishop of Bath and Wells. For other measures, see Gasquet, pp. 125-126; *The Register of the Diocese of Worcester during the Vacancy of the See* (ed. J. W. Willis-Bund), pp. 241-242; Register G (entitled *Sede Vacante*) of the Monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury, ff. 29, 36.

¹⁶ *Calendars of Papal Letters and of Papal Petitions*, *passim*; Gasquet, pp. 238-250; Capes, p. 75.

¹⁷ Gasquet, pp. xxi-xxv, 250-255; Capes, pp. 75-83. For contemporary comment, see Gower's *Vox Clamantis*, and *The Vision of William concerning Piers Plowman*.

¹⁸ On the difficult question of terminology Professor Lunt of Cornell has made many valuable suggestions, but he is not responsible for possible errors in my conclusions. I follow Capes (p. 265) in using "stipendiary" in its literal

cure of souls, acting in the place of absentee rectors, or as assistants of resident rectors or of perpetual vicars,¹⁹ in some cases taking charge of chapels at ease;²⁰ or they may be the private chaplains of great men, lay or ecclesiastical, sometimes considered much as hired servants;²¹ finally, they may be chantry priests, their sole function often consisting in singing masses²²— in the case of a private chantry, for the souls of the founder or of his family and friends,²³ in the case of a “co-operative” chantry, for the souls of the members of the fraternity.²⁴ In some instances the stipendiary chantry priest is bound by his contract to take part in the divine services, to visit the poor and the sick, or to teach grammar schools.²⁵

The rapid increase of chantries and of private chapels during the fourteenth century²⁶ led to a growing demand for stipendiary priests at just the time when the supply was being diminished both by the plague and by the promotion of many of them to fill the gaps in the ranks of rectors and vicars.²⁷ Apart from this emergency, it is to be emphasized that the priests without benefices, in contradistinction to the more aristocratic rectors and vicars, were usually appointed from the middle and lower classes²⁸ and that many of them

sense, and throughout my discussion I am referring to those stipendiary priests, whether chaplains or cantarists, who do not hold benefices. (See Gower's usage, note 159, *infra*. For beneficed chantry priests, see Register Stretton, pp. 106–107, referred to in note 122, *infra*.) According to the language of the ecclesiastical measures and according to Lyndwood's interpretation (*Provinciale*, pt. I, p. 238, note s), the canonical maximum wage laws affect only the unbeneficed, stipendiary clergy. There is, however, some doubt as to the technical definition of “benefice” in spite of Lyndwood (*ibid.*) and there is serious disagreement among modern writers as to the definition of “stipendiary”. See Gasquet, *Parish Life in Mediaeval England*, p. 98; Stubbs, III. 379; Richardson, “The Parish Clergy of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century”, in *Transactions of the Royal Hist. Society*, third series, VI. 115.

¹⁹ Cutts, pp. 106, 484; Stubbs, *ubi supra*. Gasquet designates these as curates, *Parish Life*, pp. 92–93.

²⁰ Cutts, p. 106; Gasquet, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

²¹ Cutts, p. 484; Gasquet, *ubi supra*; Abram, *English Life and Manners in the Later Middle Ages*, p. 52.

²² Stubbs considers that a large proportion of candidates were ordained on the title of chaplaincies and that the majority had neither cure of souls nor duty of preaching, their spiritual work consisting simply in saying masses for the dead. *Op. cit.*, III. 379, 384.

²³ Capes, p. 271.

²⁴ Ashley, *English Economic History*, II. 138; Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, ch. IX.

²⁵ Capes, pp. 271–272; Gasquet maintains that chantry priests are not usually mere cantarists, *Parish Life*, pp. 95–96.

²⁶ Capes, p. 271; Unwin, p. 112; *Calendars of Papal Letters and Papal Petitions*, *passim*; for the increased demand for portable altars, cf. *Cal. Papal Letters*, vol. III., preface, p. vi.

²⁷ *Calendars of Patent Rolls*, *passim*.

²⁸ Cutts, pp. 129, 484; Stubbs, *op. cit.*, III. 379–380.

had no representation in convocation.²⁹ In a very real sense, therefore, the gulf between them and the beneficed clergy, whose employees they normally were,³⁰ resembles the gulf between the laborers and the governing classes. Inevitably there occurs exactly parallel to the rise of laborers' wages as a result of the plague, an enormous rise in the salaries of unbeneficed priests. To check this rise, the great ecclesiasts enact canons that present close analogies to the secular labor laws; clerical strikes are thus met by clerical statutes of laborers.³¹

The purpose of this paper is to investigate within the separate dioceses as units the actual workings of the administrative machinery of the Church as applied to the economic crisis of 1348-1381. As far as I know, no such administrative analysis has thus far been made,³² partly because so often the county rather than the diocese has been the unit of investigation. A preliminary word as to sources will reveal the extent of my study. Aside from the relatively slight information contained in the rolls of Parliament, statutes, patent rolls, etc., and from the scanty notices to be gleaned from the chroniclers, the sources are strictly ecclesiastical: the mandates of archbishops and bishops, the constitutions of diocesan and provincial synods, the acts of consistory courts, judicial proceedings before archdeacons³³ (the last two classes of records only rarely preserved for this date),³⁴ and, finally, the records of deans and chapters.³⁵ For the period under discussion much of this eccle-

²⁹ Stubbs, *op. cit.*, III. pp. 48, 379.

³⁰ For the grievances of the beneficed clergy see Capes, pp. 265-266. Laymen might also be the employers of stipendiary priests.

³¹ Tout in his life of Islip in the *Dict. Nat. Biography* writes of the canon of 1350 as "a sort of spiritual counterpart to the Statute of Labourers".

³² Modern scholars have of course made many references to the clerical wage-laws; cf. *e. g.*, Tout's excellent summary in his article quoted *supra*, note 31; but in most cases the references are curiously incomplete and therefore misleading; cf. Richardson, pp. 115-117; *Victoria County History, Gloucester*, II. 19-20; *Dorset*, II. 22; Coulton, *Chaucer and his England*, p. 305; article on Islip in the *Dict. Eng. Church History* (ed. by Ollard and Crosse).

³³ Stubbs's admirable account of the whole series of church courts is found in "The Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Constitution and Working of the Ecclesiastical Courts", *Parl. Papers*, 1883, vol. XXIV.

³⁴ A few instances of their preservation have come to my notice; there is a register of the Ely Consistory Court for the years 1375-1381, see *Ely Episcopal Records* (ed. A. Gibbons), p. 79; Reg. Sheppey (1353-1360) contains acts of the Rochester Consistory Court, ff. 265-280. Judicial proceedings before archdeacons are sometimes mentioned in churchwardens' accounts; cf., *e. g.*, a reference for the year 1370 in the parish of St. Michael, Bath, in *Somersetshire Arch. and Nat. Hist. Soc. Proceedings*, XXVI. xv, 9. For churchwardens' accounts in general, see Gross, *Sources of English History* (first ed.), pp. 402-403. They ought to contain reports to archdeacons of offenses committed by chaplains.

³⁵ See index to *Hist. MSS. Comm. Reports*, summarized by Gross, pp. 536-539.

siastical material is still in manuscript,³⁶ a large portion of it being enrolled by the bishops in their registers.³⁷ Limitations of time forced me to restrict myself in the main to these registers³⁸ and to the additional evidence that has found its way into such printed works as Lyndwood's *Provinciale*³⁹ and Wilkins's *Concilia*.⁴⁰ For the years 1348-1381 forty-three registers are in existence for the seventeen dioceses of England;⁴¹ of these, twelve are printed either in full or in abstract,⁴² the province of Canterbury having fared far better than that of York.⁴³ In my quest of manuscript material during the year 1912-1913,⁴⁴ the difficulties of securing permission at Durham,⁴⁵ York, and Worcester proved insurmountable in the time at my disposal, so that I am obliged to confine myself to the province of Canterbury, omitting for the present the seven registers of the important diocese of Worcester.

³⁶ In some cases in the British Museum but more frequently in local ecclesiastical archives.

³⁷ For an account of the contents of registers, see Stubbs, *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, p. vii.

³⁸ Both manuscript and printed.

³⁹ Edition of 1679, Oxford. On the contents and value of this work, completed in 1430, see Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, and Ogle's bitter attack on Maitland in *The Canon Law in Mediaeval England*.

⁴⁰ Edition of 1737 (London, 4 vols.). Spelman's collection has been superseded by that of Wilkins while the various other works dealing with church history by Hody, Johnson, Joyce, Lathbury, Wake, etc., are frequently controversial in character and contain very little on my subject.

⁴¹ There are no Chichester registers earlier than 1397. The following registers are also missing: Stratford, Northburgh, and Courtenay for London; Barnet and Harewell for Bath and Wells; Bradwardine for Canterbury; Langham and Barnet for Ely; Brinton for Rochester. In Grandisson's register for Exeter, folios are wanting for the years 1362-1369; in Kirkby's register for Carlisle there are no entries later than 1347. To complete the history of a see all *sede vacante* registers should be examined.

⁴² The Hereford registers of Lewis Charleton, William Courtenay, and John Gilbert have appeared since my stay in England; also the first part of the Rochester register of Hamo Hethe. It is to be hoped that Mr. R. C. Fowler will publish his bibliography of printed registers, a paper read at the International Historical Congress of 1913.

⁴³ Except for the selections printed long ago in the Rolls Series by Raine, *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*, and for the documents in Wilkins, *Concilia*, the seven registers of the province of York for this period are still in manuscript.

⁴⁴ I wish to express my gratitude to Mr. R. C. Fowler and to Mr. C. Johnson of the Public Record Office and to the Reverend Claude Jenkins for his ready help at the library of Lambeth Palace and for his kindness in securing me access to other archives. My thanks are also due to the never-failing courtesy of the many custodians of episcopal registers. It is deeply to be regretted however that in several dioceses the working days and hours are narrowly restricted and that the fees charged make thorough research almost impossible.

⁴⁵ I was not permitted to examine the Act Books of the Prior and Convent, a necessary supplement to Bishop Hatfield's register.

For convenience, I will deal, first, with the ecclesiastical administration of the labor legislation enacted by the central government primarily for the laity; secondly, with the ecclesiastical administration of the corresponding measures enacted by ecclesiastical authority for the unbeneficed clergy, and finally, with some instances of conflict between the king's courts and the courts Christian.

I. *The Secular Legislation.*

The ordinance of laborers was issued by king and council on June 18, 1349, in the form of a letter close to the sheriff of Kent.⁴⁶ At the end is a paragraph addressed to the Bishop of Winchester⁴⁷ bidding him publish it in his diocese and order his rectors, vicars, etc., to exhort their parishioners to labor and to obey the ordinance. Further, since stipendiary chaplains are refusing to serve except at excessive salaries, the bishop is to compel them to accept the customary rates, on pain of suspension and interdict. Similar instructions are directed to all bishops and to the guardian of the spiritualities of the Archbishop of Canterbury.⁴⁸

The document is enrolled on the registers of Bath and Wells, Exeter,⁴⁹ Hereford, Rochester,⁵⁰ and Winchester.⁵¹ Bishop Trilleck sends a copy to the officials of his two archdeacons and to the Dean of Hereford Cathedral. The instructions to the latter may be cited as typical: the dean is to proclaim the ordinance in the "vulgar tongue" in market towns and in other places according to his discretion, on holy days and feast days, and at fairs and markets when there would be the greatest assemblage of people. He is also to forbid his parishioners to give alms to able-bodied beggars and is to warn all stipendiary chaplains to demand only legal salaries.⁵² The prompt proclamation of the ordinance in the diocese of Bath

⁴⁶ Putnam, app., pp. 8-12; *Statutes of the Realm*, I. 307-308, 23 Edw. III.

⁴⁷ William Edendon, bishop 1346-1366. For the dates of all the bishops referred to, see Stubbs, *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*.

⁴⁸ The prior and chapter of the monastery of Christ Church, see note 15, *supra*.

⁴⁹ *Register of John de Grandisson* (ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph), pt. I., pp. 69-71.

⁵⁰ Reg. Hethe, ff. 249-250: "Litera regis super ordinacionem servientium nolencium servire sine excessivo salario", followed by the bishop's letter to his archdeacon, "Litera super ordinacionem stipendiorum capellanorum nolentium servire sine excessivo salario", July 1, 1349; cf. Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, I. 375, and Gasquet, *The Black Death*, pp. 121-122.

⁵¹ Reg. Edyndon, pt. II., f. 72: "Execucio brevis regis contra operarios et mendicantes ordinati", June 25, 1349.

⁵² *Registrum Johannis de Trillek* (Canterbury and York Society), pp. 321-322. The editor is in error in indicating June 18, 1349, as the date of the bishop's mandate.

and Wells possibly explains the attack on Bishop Ralph during his visitation of the parish of Yeovil. "Certain sons of perdition, forming the community of the said town", armed with bows, arrows, iron bars, and stones, actually imprisoned the bishop and his servants for twenty-four hours in the church and rectory.⁵³

Allowing for missing registers⁵⁴ and for vacancies of sees,⁵⁵ it appears that out of eleven possible cases, there is evidence for the action of five bishops in obedience to the royal mandate.⁵⁶

II. The Ecclesiastical Measures.

On May 28, 1350, shortly after Islip's accession to the primacy,⁵⁷ he issues, apparently on his sole authority,⁵⁸ the first general ecclesiastical mandate on clerical stipends, beginning: "Effrenata generis humani cupiditas".⁵⁹ On July 16, 1362, after the ravages of the second plague and after a decade of attempts to secure enforcement of the *Effrenata* in various dioceses, Islip "with bitterness of heart" addresses a complaint of neglect to Bishop Sudbury of London,⁶⁰ adding that "on the authority of some of his fellow-bishops and other magnates of the realm"⁶¹ he has drawn up more specific instructions. This document, preserved apparently only on a London register and hitherto unnoticed by historians, is important as anticipating the main provisions of a more famous measure. In the

⁵³ *Register of Ralph of Shrewsbury* (Somerset Record Society, X.), pp. 593-595, 596-597.

⁵⁴ Chichester and London; Worcester must be excluded for the present.

⁵⁵ Canterbury. In Register G. f. 51 (see note 15, *supra*), under date of July 2, 1349, the prior of Christ Church complains to the official of the archdeacon of the scarcity of parish priests and bids him summon the cantarists to obey the ordinance.

⁵⁶ Of the statute of 1351 I have found no trace and only one instance of the enrollment of that of 1361, namely in Reg. Islip, f. 171.

⁵⁷ December 20, 1349.

⁵⁸ Maitland, *Roman Canon Law*, p. 32, quotes Lyndwood to show that provincial legislation proceeded from the archbishop rather than from the provincial council.

⁵⁹ "Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis mandatum ad compellendum capellanos ad deserviendum ecclesiis curatis, et recipiendum moderata salaria." Wilkins, III. 1-2. Except where Wilkins prints from British Museum transcripts, I give references to his volumes instead of to the manuscript registers.

⁶⁰ Reg. Sudbury, f. 143. I am indebted to the courtesy of Mr. R. C. Fowler for the opportunity of examining his transcripts of this register.

⁶¹ "Nobis vero et nonnullis confratribus nostris aliisque majoribus de regno." The anomalous form of the assembly is puzzling; but see John of Reading's account of Islip's council in August, 1362, as responsible for a measure concerning priests' salaries (ed. Tait), pp. 153-154. Cf. also Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), I. 297, and Hody, *History of English Councils and Convocations*, pt. III., p. 201.

Parliament that met at Westminster the following October,⁶² the Commons complain of the exorbitant rates charged by chaplains and, ignoring the fact of the existing enactments, beg the king to request the archbishops and bishops to issue a constitution on the subject. The ecclesiasts present in Parliament accede to the king's request and answer in the same session that they have fixed legal rates for priests and have imposed penalties on ecclesiastical "givers" of excess as well as on "takers".⁶³ Their response is the second *Effrenata*, recorded in Islip's register as issued on November 9, "by the advice and consent of his brothers".⁶⁴ The last step is the acceptance of the *Effrenata* by the king and the enactment by him with the consent of the Magnates and of the Commons of a provision imposing penalties on lay infringers of the ecclesiastical measure.⁶⁵ There is constitutional significance in the sequence of events; if my account is correct, it disproves the theory accepted by most scholars, including Stubbs, that Parliament passed a statute fixing priests' salaries.⁶⁶ In other words, it is not a case of legislation of the laity for the clergy⁶⁷ but merely a striking example of harmonious co-operation between Church and State.

The last measure of my period was framed at the time of the Parliament that sat from October 20 to November 16, 1378, the second year of Richard II., meeting at the remote city of Gloucester for reasons important in the history of the Church.⁶⁸ On the very last day of the session, while the monastery of St. Peter was still

⁶² The session lasted from a few days after October 13 to November 13; *Rot. Parl.*, II. 268-273; cf. Tait's note to John of Reading, p. 302.

⁶³ *Rot. Parl.*, II. 271; *Statutes of the Realm*, I. 373-374.

⁶⁴ F. 188: "Ordinacio sive statutum super salario a presbiteris percipiendo . . . Datum apud Lambeth V Idus Novembris", addressed to the Bishop of London. The document is wrongly dated by Wilkins, III. 50-51, and by Professor Tait, p. 301.

⁶⁵ "The king, accepting this ordinance with the assent of the magnates and commonalty, ordained". *Cal. Pat. Rolls*. 1364-1367, p. 67; *Rot. Parl.*, II. 271; *Statutes of the Realm*, I. 374, 36 Edw. III., st. 1, c. 8.

⁶⁶ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, III. 344: "In 1362 a statute fixed the wages of stipendiary chaplains." Cf. also Hunt, *The English Church in the Middle Ages*, p. 205: "The Bishops reported Islip's constitution, which was thus turned into a parliamentary statute."

⁶⁷ So classified by Stubbs, *ubi supra*, pp. 332-334. Islip's earlier mandate, quoted in note 82, *infra*, expressly commands the obedience of the laity. Wilkins, III. 2.

⁶⁸ *Rot. Parl.*, III. 32. The session did not actually begin till October 21, and is vividly described in *Historia et Cartularium Monasterii S. Petri Gloucestriae* (Rolls Series), I. 52-54. It was rumored that there was a plot to destroy the liberties of the Church which the Londoners would have frustrated but God saved the Church even at Gloucester, *ibid.* Cf. also *Continuation of Murimuth* (Eng. Hist. Soc.), pp. 234-235; Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), I. 380.

full to overflowing with the vast concourse of Lords and of Commons, so that in the words of the chronicler, "it seemed more like a place for a fair than a religious house", Archbishop Sudbury summoned "his brothers and suffragans" to a certain chamber within the monastery for the express purpose of dealing with clerical salaries, and with their "advice and consent" formulated the third *Effrenata*⁶⁹ issued ten days later from Lambeth.⁷⁰ It is significant that Lyndwood states specifically that the penalties here decreed apply only to clerical offenders and that he has heard that the Gloucester Parliament enacted a statute to punish lay "givers" of excess salaries to priests.⁷¹ Such a statute I have been unable to find.⁷²

An analysis of the ecclesiastical laws just listed shows how greatly episcopal eloquence exceeds that of lay legislators. Instead of the Statute of Laborers' brief phrase, "the malice of servants", etc.,⁷³ there is a long rhetorical introduction to Islip's *Effrenata* of 1350, of which I give a summary: The unbridled covetousness of the human race would grow to such a height as to banish charity out of the world, if it were not repressed by justice. Many complaints and long experience reveal that the priests who have survived the plague, not realizing that they have been saved merely in order to serve God and his people and not in the least ashamed of setting a pernicious example to lay workmen, completely neglect

⁶⁹ Wilkins, III. 135-136: "Statutum super salariis presbyterorum factum per Simonem Sudbury Cantuariensem archiepiscopum. . . . Nos tamen, temporum qualitate attenta, de fratrum et suffraganeorum nostrorum XVI die mensis Novembris. . . . in quadam camera infra septa monasterii apostolorum Petri et Pauli Gloucestriae . . . propter hoc insimul congregatorum consilio et assensu super salariis sacerdotum parochialium, et annualium . . . de caetero percipendis, ordinamus et statuimus." Wake's comment is as follows: "This was another Remarkable Transaction . . . That here was a long and a busy Parliament held, and no Convocation with it. And at the Close of this Parliament an Ecclesiastical Synod of Bishops only; no Presbyters, no Regular Prelates, called into a part of it." *State of the Church and Clergy*, p. 311.

⁷⁰ "Data apud Lambeth. . . . 6 Kal. Decembris, A. D. 1378", Wilkins, *ubi supra*. Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation*, pp. 87-88, errs in stating that a synod to regulate clerical salaries was held at Lambeth in this year.

⁷¹ Pt. I., pp. 240-241, note e: "Haec itaque Constitutio non arctat Laicos, saltem quoad poenam hic positam. Quare autem non fuit idem Statutum quoad Laicos, potest esse ratio; quia contra Laicos in eadem materia emanavit Statutum Regium etiam poenale, editum (ut audivi) in Parlamento Gloucestriae, ubi etiam facta fuit haec Constitutio 16 die Novembris anno domini * 1368 (* ms. Aetion 1378)."

⁷² It is probable that the ecclesiasts had acted at the instigation of Parliament (*cf.* the petition of 1376, *infra*, p. 29). This was the session at which the ordinance of laborers was made a statute. *Statutes of the Realm*, II. 11, 2 R. II., st. 1, c. 8.

⁷³ Putnam, *app.*, p. 12.

the cure of souls, preferring to celebrate annals and insisting on exorbitant salaries; unless their "irrational appetites" can be checked, many churches will remain empty. In order to limit their "insatiable desires", acceptance of a cure of souls is made compulsory and maximum annual salaries are somewhat vaguely named: for chaplains of parish churches, prebends, and chapels, including cure of souls, one mark above the old rate; for all others, the old rates; escape to another diocese is not permitted; the above to be enforced by ecclesiastical penalties.⁷⁴

The next measure, the mandate of July, 1362, shows increased bitterness of language; priests are scarcely satisfied with double the old rates and are drowned in an abyss of voluptuousness, costly apparel, and shameless luxury, contrary to their vows and to apostolic doctrine. The maximum annual rates are now carefully specified: for priests with small cures, six marks; with large ones, seven marks; without cures, five marks.⁷⁵

The opening paragraph of the second *Effrenata*, of November, 1362, is identical with that of the first, while the succeeding clauses reveal growing episcopal indignation: the covetous priests of modern times in their passion for voluptuous living refuse cures of souls, preferring to celebrate annals for the quick and the dead; pampered with exorbitant salaries, they discharge their intemperance in vomit and lust, become delirious with licentiousness, and finally drown themselves in an abyss of vice, to the great scandal of ecclesiasts and a most pernicious example to laymen.⁷⁶ The remedies provided for the speedy curing of this "pestilential disease" are almost identical with those of the earlier constitutions, compulsory acceptance of a cure of souls,⁷⁷ and the same maximum annual rates as in the July mandate, except that in the case of a "large cure" discretion is vested in the diocesan. The penalties for excess rates now correspond very closely to those of the wage clause of the ordinance of laborers:⁷⁸ "takers" are to forfeit to the church the amount of the "excess" and ecclesiastical "givers" double the amount; priests are forbidden to leave their diocese without "letters commendatory" from the bishop. Finally, by the parliamentary

⁷⁴ Note 59, *supra*.

⁷⁵ Note 60, *supra*.

⁷⁶ Note 64, *supra*.

⁷⁷ This clause is now more explicit: under threat of suspension, at the discretion of the diocesan or ordinary, non-beneficed chaplains are to be compelled to serve parish churches and chapels with cure of souls, if offered suitable salaries.

⁷⁸ Putnam, app., p. 10.

enactment, lay "givers" of illegal salaries are to forfeit to the king a sum equal to the entire amount paid.⁷⁹

The third *Effrenata*, of 1378, opens by quoting the second and then after the significant phrase, "taking into consideration the circumstances of the time",⁸⁰ issues a schedule two marks higher than the rates of 1362: for priests with cures, eight marks; for cantarists, seven marks;⁸¹ excommunication is now specified as the penalty.

In turning to the subject of administration of the four measures we find Islip setting an admirable example of promptness in his own diocese of Canterbury by sending to his commissary general for proclamation on Sundays and feast days a copy of the first *Effrenata* on May 29, 1350, the day after its issue.⁸² For the province as distinct from the diocese the normal method is followed: the archbishop sends the *Effrenata* on May 28 to Bishop Stratford of London as dean of the province, with a request to enforce it in his own diocese, to make a list of runaway priests, and to inform the other bishops of its provisions; all reports are due before September 8.⁸³ Bishop Stratford's register is lost⁸⁴ but it appears that he acted with fair speed. The registers of Bath and Wells,⁸⁵ Exeter,⁸⁶ Hereford, Salisbury,⁸⁷ and Winchester contain the full text of the *Effrenata*, accompanied in every case except the last by a letter of Bishop Stratford, dated June 8. Bishop Trilleck of Hereford enrolls his return under date of August 31, and shows his zeal by informing the archbishop that even before the receipt of the *Effrenata*, he had called a synod of his clergy and by their advice and consent had decreed that priests should be satisfied with suitable salaries; he

⁷⁹ Note 65, *supra*.

⁸⁰ Note 69, *supra*. "Leges namque et Constitutiones convenire debent temporibus suis", Lyndwood, pt. I., p. 240, note m.

⁸¹ The rates may be food, with 4 or 3 marks, respectively. Lyndwood considers that the phrase "animabus defunctorum" probably limits the application of the second schedule to cantarists for the dead, pt. I., p. 240, note n.

⁸² Wilkins, III, 2: "Ejusdem mandatum aliud pro diocesa Cantuariensi de salariis capellanorum". The diocesan jurisdiction of the archbishop is exercised through a commissary. Stubbs, "Report", p. xxi, quoted note 33, *supra*.

⁸³ Note 59, *supra*.

⁸⁴ Note 41, *supra*; but a later London register contains the complete document, preceded by a statement that a copy had been sent to Bishop Stratford. Reg. Sudbury, f. 142.

⁸⁵ Reg. Ralph of Shrewsbury (Somerset Record Society, X.), pp. 639-640.

⁸⁶ Reg. John de Grandisson, pt. II., pp. 1116-1118: "De stipendiis, presbiterorum". The editor's date of 1352 is clearly an error.

⁸⁷ Reg. Wyvyl, ff. 207-208: "Mandatum archiepiscopi ad compellendum capellanos ad deserviendum curis". The year is given as 1351 instead of as 1350.

now promises to compel obedience by ecclesiastical penalties.⁸⁸ Bishop Edendon of Winchester sends copies of the *Effrenata* on July 10 addressed to his official and to his two archdeacons or their officials, with urgent commands for enforcement and with a request for reports by August 15.⁸⁹

The case of Lincoln shows the extreme punctuality demanded by the archbishop; on September 8, according to his register,⁹⁰ the very day after the reports were due, he writes to Bishop Gynwell, charging him with scornful and contemptuous disobedience of the provisions of the *Effrenata* (a copy of which he had received through the medium of the Bishop of London) and with failure in making his report. Islip adds that he will deal mercifully with Gynwell, merely requiring the report at a later date. The result is unfortunately not recorded on the Lincoln register for this year, but it seems probable that the incident is accounted for by the exemption from the jurisdiction of the archbishop secured by the Bishop of Lincoln through a papal bull.⁹¹

Islip's next step is a reproachful letter on February 18, 1352, to Bishop Stratford complaining that priests care more for money than for the safety of their souls and that in the diocese of London there is a particularly large number of runaway clergy, who are under ecclesiastical sentences for disobedience to the *Effrenata*.⁹² Bishop Stratford is therefore urged to enforce the law more vigorously in his own diocese and to see that his fellow-suffragans do likewise in theirs; reports are called for before June 24. The registers of Bath and Wells⁹³ and Salisbury⁹⁴ contain Stratford's letters of April 2, enclosing the archbishop's mandate, dated curiously enough March 6 instead of February 18; while both docu-

⁸⁸ Reg. *Johannis de Trillek*, pp. 157-159: "Ordinacio domini archiepiscopi de stipendiis capellanorum".

⁸⁹ Reg. Edyndon, pt. II., f. 23: "Mandatum ad compellendum presbiteros ecclesiis parochialibus et curis animarum deservire".

⁹⁰ Wilkins, III. 8: "Injunctio episcopo Lincolnensi . . . sed vos, spretis mandatis, et injunctionibus nostris hujusmodi vobis traditis, et per vos receptis, nobis in praemissis seu eorum aliquo parere, seu nos de hiis, quae in ea parte duxeritis facere, certificare non curastis, sed contemptibiliter omisistis." A similar letter to Gynwell on November 28 charges him with disobedience to another archiepiscopal command, *ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁹¹ *Cal. Papal Letters*, III. 283, 433, 489; Hody, *Hist. English Councils and Convocations*, pt. III., p. 192.

⁹² Wilkins, III. 15: "Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis mandatum ad compellendum presbyteros annualia celebrantes ut deserviant ecclesiis curatis. . . . Dudum propter insatiabilem capellanorum avaritiam." According to Gasquet there was in London a relatively larger number of unbeneficed clergy than elsewhere, *The Black Death*, p. 203, note 1.

⁹³ Reg. *Ralph of Shrewsbury*, p. 693.

⁹⁴ Reg. Wyvyl, f. 208: "Mandatum super eodem. . . ."

ments are enrolled on June 18 by the Bishop of Winchester, together with his promise to compel obedience on the part of his chaplains.⁹⁵ Although Bishop Grandisson of Exeter had sent copies to three of his archdeacons and to the official of his "peculiar" jurisdiction in Cornwall,⁹⁶ the result is clearly not satisfactory; on January 12, 1354, the bishop writes a voluminous epistle complaining that in spite of the public proclamations modern priests desert cures of souls for chantries, care more for feasting and taverns than for divine services—a most pernicious example to laymen—and also insist on exorbitant salaries. He bids his chief official and his archdeacons publish the law in their chapters with due solemnity and with threats of the greater excommunication, and send him the names of delinquents before February 22.⁹⁷ Bishop Gynwell of Lincoln still refrains from enrolling Islip's commands, but frames an ordinance of his own for compulsory service of their cures by chaplains at specified rates.⁹⁸ Islip's attempt to enforce his own mandate of 1352 in the diocese of Canterbury is combined with a sumptuary law for clerical clothes issued on October 30, 1353, addressed to his commissary general, to the official of his archdeacon, and to all the deans, and full of the usual complaints of the neglect of the ordinance.⁹⁹

The constitution of July 16, 1362, as has already been stated, is apparently recorded only in Sudbury's London register, which also contains the later edition—the second *Effranata*, of November 9, sent to the Bishop of London with the usual instructions for promulgation and a request for all reports before February 2, 1363.¹⁰⁰ The Bishop of Bath and Wells apparently did not receive a copy till January 19, and on February 16 forwarded it to the official of the Archdeacon of Wells, with the usual orders for publication.¹⁰¹ Bishop Edendon of Winchester seems to have been

⁹⁵ Reg. Edyndon, pt. II., f. 25: "Certificacio mandati archiepiscopi ad puniendum et compescendum capellanos in exactione salarii excessivi".

⁹⁶ Reg. John de Grandisson, pt. II., pp. 1115–1116: "De capellanis, tam Parochialibus quam Annalibus". The date of Stratford's letter is April 6. For an account of "peculiars", see Stubbs, "Report", pp. xx–xxi.

⁹⁷ Register, pt. II., pp. 1139–1141: "Ad monendum Presbiteros stipendiarios ut consuetis stipendiis contentur". Cf. *ibid.*, p. 1150.

⁹⁸ Referred to in his register (vol. VIII., modern numbering), October 15, 1352, f. 23: "Monicio quod capellanus deserviat ecclesie de . . . juxta formam ordinacionis nostre alias generaliter super hoc facte . . . pro stipendiis per nos taxatis." A similar entry is enrolled on October 17.

⁹⁹ Wilkins, III. 29–31: "Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis ordinatio super honestate clericorum in apparatu et etiam super salario sacerdotum".

¹⁰⁰ Ff. 143–144; see pp. 18, 19, *supra*.

¹⁰¹ Reg. Ralph of Shrewsbury, pp. 782–783. The date of the *Effrenata* is printed as December 1, 1352.

notified far more promptly; for on November 16 he sends copies to his two archdeacons,¹⁰² ordering public proclamation in chapters and churches before clergy and laity and requesting reports before January 13.¹⁰³ On the Lincoln register there is enrolled in February, 1362—a few months earlier than either of Islip's measures of that year—a mandate of Bishop Gynwell, drawn up "with the advice, deliberation and consent of the chapter of Lincoln and of others learned in the law": Because of the avarice of priests who follow in the footsteps of Baal and by unlawful covenants secure exorbitant salaries—specified maximum rates are to be proclaimed by the official of the Archdeacon of Lincoln in every session of his chapter and in all parish churches, and lists of delinquents are to be reported annually.¹⁰⁴

The see was vacant during the autumn of 1362¹⁰⁵ but Bishop Bokyngham who succeeded Gynwell on June 25, 1363, grants a license early in 1364 permitting a chaplain to receive more than the usual salary "in spite of any constitution on the subject",¹⁰⁶ and some months later obtains the appointment of a royal commission of oyer and terminer to investigate the assault made by chaplains on the parsons¹⁰⁷ who had been deputed to act as the bishop's commissaries in enforcing the second *Effrenata*. The chaplains, bound together by oaths, had broken up the parsons' sessions by horrible words, almost killing them and even lying in wait for the bishop himself.¹⁰⁸

In the promulgation of the third *Effrenata*, there is a delay which I am unable to explain. Framed on November 16, 1378, it was sent ten days later to Bishop Courtenay of London—according to Archbishop Sudbury's register—with a request for a report before the following Easter;¹⁰⁹ yet the copies enrolled on the registers of

¹⁰² Addressed to the archdeacons or their officials.

¹⁰³ Reg. Edyndon, pt. II., f. 48 (or 58): "Execucio mandati archiepiscopi contra sacerdotes in recipiendis salariis excedentes".

¹⁰⁴ Reg. Gynwell (vol. VIII.), f. 186: "Constitutio de stipendiis capellanorum".

¹⁰⁵ Gynwell had died on August 5.

¹⁰⁶ Reg. Bukynham, f. 15: "Licencia pro salario capellani . . . non obstante constitucione", January 2.

¹⁰⁷ "Parson" is equivalent to "rector", according to Gasquet, *Parish Life*, p. 71.

¹⁰⁸ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1364–1367, pp. 67–68, September 4. The riot occurred in the archdeaconry of Leicester.

¹⁰⁹ *Supra*, p. 20.

Ely,¹¹⁰ Exeter,¹¹¹ Salisbury,¹¹² and Worcester¹¹³ are dated Lambeth, September 6, 1379, and the accompanying letters of Bishop Courtenay, September 18, the return being called for before Christmas. Bishop Arundel of Ely reports on November 28 that he has published the *Effrenata* in a full diocesan synod and in other congregations of clergy; Bishop Erghum of Salisbury sends copies on October 8 to his four archdeacons,¹¹⁴ with the usual instructions and a request for reports before November 30. Bishop Brantingham, now treasurer of England, sends a copy from London on October 4 to the Dean of Exeter Cathedral, explaining that difficult public business prevents him from giving his personal attention to the matter; therefore, he bids the dean publish the *Effrenata* in the cathedral with due solemnity, reporting to the bishop, or to his official, or to the president of the consistory court, before November 30, with a list of delinquents. Similar letters are sent to the four archdeacons.¹¹⁵

A summary of the evidence for the fourteen southern dioceses, allowance being made in each instance for missing registers and vacancies of sees, shows attempts at enforcement of the law in a little over half the possible cases:

- (I) The *Effrenata* of 1350—6 out of 11 possible times.¹¹⁶
- (II) The mandate of 1352—6 out of 10 possible times.¹¹⁷
- (III) The *Effrenata* of 1362—5 out of 10 possible times.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁰ Reg. Arundell, f. 88: "Mandatum pro salariis presbiterorum provincie Cantuariensis". It is summarized in *Ely Diocesan Remembrancer*, vols. 1895-1897, p. 160.

¹¹¹ Reg. Thomas de Brantyngham (ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph), pt. I., p. 405: "Pro salariis presbiterorum".

¹¹² Reg. Ergham, ff. 39-40: "Mandatum ad publicandum statutum editum a domino S[imone] Cantuariensi archiepiscopo et suffraganeis suis super salariis sive stipendiis presbiterorum percipiendis in provincia Cantuariensi".

¹¹³ The day of the month is not indicated by Mr. Willis-Bund in his reference to a clerical wage-law of 1379 enrolled on Reg. Wakefield, f. 130; *Vict. County Hist., Worcester*, II. 33.

¹¹⁴ Addressed to the archdeacons or their officials.

¹¹⁵ For the references to the last three registers, see notes 110, 112, 111, *supra*.

¹¹⁶ Bath and Wells, Canterbury, Exeter, Hereford, Salisbury, Winchester. Cf. also Sudbury's London register for a later date and Islip's controversy with the Bishop of Lincoln; *supra* p. 22, note 84; p. 23. The Chichester and London registers are missing; Worcester must be excluded.

¹¹⁷ Bath and Wells, Canterbury, Exeter, Salisbury, Winchester, and probably Lincoln. For the missing registers, see note 116, *supra*; Rochester is *sede vacante* from May 4, 1352, to March 10, 1353.

¹¹⁸ Bath and Wells, London, Winchester; for Lincoln, see *supra*, p. 25; for Canterbury, see note 156, *infra*. The Chichester and Ely registers are missing; Worcester must be excluded; the folios for 1362 are lost in the Exeter register (see Reg. Grandisson, pt. II., p. v; pt. III., p. lxxii).

(IV) The *Effrenata* of 1378—4 out of 10 possible times.¹¹⁹

From the administrative point of view the problem is this: Does the absence of a constitution from the folios of a given register prove that a bishop ignored its provisions? Several considerations point to a negative answer. In the first place, there is the merely mechanical detail that from the time of the great plague there was a change for the worse in the fullness of the make-up of registers; in fact, by the end of the Middle Ages registers normally contained little more than ordinations and institutions to benefices.¹²⁰ Secondly, for the fourteenth century, the registers of certain dioceses are far fuller than those of others; at the one extreme for my subject stand the Canterbury,¹²¹ Bath and Wells, and Exeter registers, at the other extreme, come the Lichfield and Coventry¹²² and Norwich registers, the latter being little more than "Institution Books".¹²³ Thirdly, the case of Lincoln shows that the argument *a silentio* is not conclusive.¹²⁴ Finally, since the authorities actually engaged in enforcing provincial constitutions are the bishops' officials, the archdeacons¹²⁵ and their officials, and more rarely the deans, rectors, vicars, etc., the full extent of their activities can be gauged only by a more exhaustive knowledge of the records of their proceedings than is yet at our command.

III. Conflict of Jurisdiction between the Secular Courts and the Courts Christian.¹²⁶

The contract clause of the ordinance of 1349, although undoubtedly designed to prevent manual laborers from deserting their masters before the end of their stipulated term, was held by Edward III.'s judges to apply to employees distinctly above the grade of laborers, to bailiffs, merchants, school-teachers, and at first even to

¹¹⁹ Ely, Exeter, Salisbury, and Worcester. The Bath and Wells, Chichester, London, and Rochester registers are missing.

¹²⁰ *Reg. Grandisson*, pt. II., p. vi; pt. III., p. lxxix.

¹²¹ Yet Islip fails to enroll his own mandate of July, 1362 (see *supra*, p. 18), and Wykeham's Winchester register so lauded by Stubbs (*Reg. Sacrum Anglicanum*, p. vii) omits the third *Effrenata*.

¹²² If the printed abstracts are complete; see William Salt Archaeological Society, I., *Reg. Norbury*; VIII., new series, *Reg. Stretton*.

¹²³ The registers of Bateman, Percy, and Spenser.

¹²⁴ *Supra*, p. 23.

¹²⁵ For the relative powers of archdeacons and of the bishops' officials, see Lyndwood, pt. I., p. 239, note e; Ollard and Crosse, pp. 154-159. The president of the consistory court is mentioned once, *supra*, p. 26.

¹²⁶ For conflicts between Church and State in the fourteenth century, see Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, vol. III., ch. XIX., and Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, II. 251-255.

chaplains.¹²⁷ Fitz Herbert, writing in the sixteenth century, states specifically that "gentlemen, chaplains, or carpenters" while not liable under the compulsory service clause can be sued in the king's courts for breach of contract.¹²⁸ He thus completely ignores the striking change of legal opinion as to chaplains that occurred toward the end of Edward's reign. An exceedingly condensed year-book report of 1372 contains the statement that a retainer to chant masses does not come under the ordinance of laborers, while the report and record of another case in the court of common pleas in 1376 fortunately preserve a rather full discussion.¹²⁹ On the one side, it is urged that the ordinance applies only to laborers and artificers and that the chaplain is neither, but a servant of God; he is not, like a laborer, bound to serve but can stop singing masses for a week at a time if he please; jurisdiction over him belongs to his ordinary and not to the king's court, since there is no mention of chaplains in the ordinance of laborers. On the other side, it is pleaded that a parochial chaplain may be considered a laborer, even if other chaplains are not, since he has many duties besides chanting masses, namely, visiting the sick, administering the sacraments to them, and assisting parsons. In spite of this last plea, the judgment is against the jurisdiction of the royal courts¹³⁰ and establishes a precedent that was followed during the next century.¹³¹ If we are to believe the complaints of the Commons, the courts Christian go still further and under the pretext of a right to all cases of *laesio fidei* are dealing with pleas concerning laborers and artificers under the new statute.¹³²

Another topic on debatable ground is clerical extortion: presentments before the king's bench show archdeacons and other ecclesiasts persistently charging enormous sums for wills¹³³ and at least one instance of a vicar refusing to perform marriage ceremonies except for exorbitant fees.¹³⁴ Extortion in this sense how-

¹²⁷ Putnam, pp. 78, 179-199, app., p. 9.

¹²⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 180, note 2, for the full quotation from *New Natura Brevium*.

¹²⁹ Putnam, pp. 188-189, app., pp. 432-437. The record of the latter case is dated Easter term, the report Trinity term.

¹³⁰ "Belknap . . . il nous est avis et a nous compaignons de bank le Roy auxy, que n'est lie per statute, come auter person est." *Ibid.*, app., p. 433.

¹³¹ Reeves, *History of English Law*, II. 247: "Of course it was held that such persons [*i. e.* chaplains] were not within the statute"; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 275, and Putnam, p. 180.

¹³² *Rot. Parl.*, II. 319; cf. Holdsworth, II. 252.

¹³³ *Rot. Parl.*, II. 230, 305, 376; III. 43; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1350-1354, p. 228; Capes, p. 240. The case of John Evot, archdeacon of Bucks, is well worth study; see my article on "Ancient Indictments" in *Eng. Hist. Review*, XXIX. 499.

¹³⁴ Putnam, app., p. 171.

ever is not strictly a part of my present subject, while extortion in the wider sense of excessive clerical salaries seems clearly to belong to the courts Christian except in the case of the punishment of lay "givers" of excess, apparently reserved to the king's courts by the statute of 1362.¹³⁵ It is therefore a surprise to find clear evidence of the usurpation of jurisdiction by the secular courts both before and after 1362. In 1354 the Chester justices of laborers listen to a presentment of chaplains for receiving "superfluous salary".¹³⁶ During Trinity term, 1363, the justices of the king's bench hear indictments from Bristol, Gloucester, and neighboring places against hundreds of chaplains charged with receiving "excess salaries contrary to the statute". One example must suffice: The great inquest states that all the chaplains celebrating annals and all parochial chaplains in the town of Gloucester are taking excess salaries and that their names are not known. Therefore they are instructed to make inquiries on behalf of the king from the bailiffs of said town and to report on all the names both of givers and of takers. And they say that according to a rough estimate there are sixty chaplains celebrating [annals] in said town.¹³⁷

It seems probable that these Gloucestershire indictments had not gone unchallenged by the courts Christian; for in 1376 the Commons petition that the king's justices shall be impowered to punish all offenders against clerical wage-laws, both "takers" and "givers", and that double the excess shall be forfeited to the king.¹³⁸ In spite of the case in the court of common pleas perhaps being argued at just the same time,¹³⁹ the Commons claim that clerical salaries are a matter of contract and that all contract belongs to the royal courts.¹⁴⁰

In considering the ecclesiastical legislation as a whole the close analogies to the principles of the secular legislation are worthy of

¹³⁵ *Supra*, pp. 21-22.

¹³⁶ Putnam, app., p. 147.

¹³⁷ Ancient Indictments 29, m. 38; there are a number of membranes containing similar presentments. The court of king's bench sits at Gloucester, Bristol, Newport, and Worcester during this term; see my article quoted in note 133, *supra*, p. 503. For the peculiar relation of the mayor of Bristol to the appointment of chantry priests, see Ricart, *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar* (ed. L. T. Smith, Camden Soc., new series, V.), pp. 76-77, and *The Little Red Book of Bristol* (ed. F. B. Bickley), I. xxix-xxxI, 114, 195-198, 210, 215.

¹³⁸ *Rot. Parl.*, II. 368. Cf. *ibid.*, IV. 121, for a similar petition in the reign of Henry V.

¹³⁹ The Good Parliament sat from April 28 to July 6 (Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, fourth ed., II. 448-449) and the case referred to (*supra*, p. 28) was argued in Easter term of that year, that is, between April 30 and May 26.

¹⁴⁰ Unwin records the indictment in a spiritual court of a craftsman for breach of sworn agreement with his fellows, pp. 92, 108.

note. The endeavor to check the mobility of the laborer¹⁴¹ is paralleled by the restriction on the migration of chaplains,¹⁴² the episcopal "letters commendatory" reminding one strongly of the "letters testimonial" devised later for laborers.¹⁴³ Although the secular compulsory service clause was held not to apply to priests,¹⁴⁴ there is an ecclesiastical compulsory service clause for the unbene-ficed clergy,¹⁴⁵ so far-reaching in its consequences as to raise doubts in the mind of the great canonist. Lyndwood finally concludes that in dire need members of religious houses and even the private chaplains of great men may be forced to serve parish churches—provided that a higher or at least an equal salary be offered.¹⁴⁶ The importance of the clause is shown by the fact that in several registers the marginal heading is: "A mandate to compel priests to serve cures of souls", instead of the more usual: "Concerning priests' salaries".¹⁴⁷ The question of contract is of course involved in the maximum wage laws; just as the statutory rates technically prohibited masters and servants from entering into contracts to raise wages,¹⁴⁸ so the canonical rates prevented chaplains from bargaining for increased salaries.¹⁴⁹

As for the equity of the clerical wage-laws and for their probable effectiveness, the problem is in my judgment even more complex than that of the secular wage-laws and can by no means be solved at present; but a few points may be emphasized. In accordance with the prevailing orthodox economic theory of reasonable or just price—itself the creation of churchmen¹⁵⁰—the Church

¹⁴¹ Putnam, pp. 74, 154-157, 160, 181, 222.

¹⁴² *Supra*, p. 21. Although the statutes of laborers do not interfere with the movements of chaplains (*cf.* Holdsworth, II. 384), it is clear that the latter are by no means free to migrate without permission.

¹⁴³ *Statutes of the Realm*, II. 56, 12 R. II., c. 3.

¹⁴⁴ *Supra*, p. 28.

¹⁴⁵ *Supra*, p. 21.

¹⁴⁶ Pt. I., p. 239, note c. Johnson claims that Lyndwood proves his thesis from canon law which he says is of greater authority than provincial councils and adds that though Lyndwood's references do not prove it, yet his opinion prevailed. *A Collection of the Laws and Canons of the Church of England*, I. 423.

¹⁴⁷ For the first type, see notes 87, 89, 92, 98; for the second, see notes 64, 69, 82, 86, 88, 95, 97, 103, 104, *supra*. Occasionally the two are combined, note 59.

¹⁴⁸ Putnam, pp. 75, 154-163, 177-179, 189-199.

¹⁴⁹ "Nullatenus ex pacto ultra id percepturi", *Effrenata* of 1378, Wilkins, III. 135; "ultra septem marcas nullo modo conveniat", Islip's mandate of 1353, *ibid.*, p. 29. *Cf.* Bishop Langham's prohibition against agreements to increase salaries by extra fees, *Acta Synodi a Simone Langham episcopo Eliensi habitae*, *ibid.*, III. 60. Lyndwood's phraseology shows that previously clerical salaries had often been regulated by agreement: "ex pacto", "ex conventionione sive pacto", pt. I., p. 238, note a, p. 240, note q.

¹⁵⁰ A convenient summary is given by Ashley, *English Economic History*, vol. I., ch. III.

had endeavored some years before the plague to secure a minimum wage for the clergy, in order that they should not beg, to the disgrace of their order, or be forced to be clad in unsuitable garb.¹⁵¹ Then came the economic crisis after the Black Death: instead of the customary salaries of 5 marks (or even 4) for a chaplain with cure of souls or of 60 shillings or less for a cantarist, the rates demanded varied from 7 to 12 marks, occasionally even 10 pounds, or to put it roughly, were often more than double the old rates.¹⁵² Just how much the rise was justified by the increased cost of living remains to be proved;¹⁵³ as does the chronicler's statement that the enforcement of the lower rates compelled priests to steal.¹⁵⁴ As an argument for the futility of the restriction may be cited the fact of the increased rates legalized by Sudbury's *Effrenata*¹⁵⁵ or of the issue of licenses by bishops, even by Archbishop Islip, sanctioning higher rates in special instances.¹⁵⁶ The threatened departure of an Oxford chaplain in 1350 unless he could secure the amount demanded may prove the necessity of such licenses.¹⁵⁷ It is well also to note that the ecclesiasts by their phraseology often show a full recognition of the exigencies of the situation and that the Bishop of Ely in 1364 records his anxiety for the suitable payment of priests.¹⁵⁸ Only a statistical study can help us to decide whether we should join Islip and Sudbury, Gower,¹⁵⁹ and the author of *Piers the Plowman*.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵¹ At the council of Oxford, 1222, Wilkins, I. 587; at the synod of Exeter, 1287, *ibid.*, II. 147. Cf. Richardson, pp. 89, 91, 113-115, and Lyndwood, pt. I., pp. 64, 65.

¹⁵² For figures see Knighton (Rolls Series), II. 63; *Reg. Grandisson*, I. 1139; *Reg. Gynwell* (vol. VIII.), f. 186; mandate of July, 1362, p. 21, *supra*; Rogers, *Hist. of Agriculture and Prices*, II. 576, 579; Richardson, p. 89, note 1; Capes, p. 29; *Rot. Parl.*, II. 271.

¹⁵³ Cf. Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* (ed. Petit Dutaillis, app. on "Causes du Soulèvement de 1381"), II. 867-868; also Tait's edition of John of Reading, pp. xi, 302.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 154: "Quod plures furari coegit ac praedari"; cf. also Walsingham, *Hist. Anglicana* (Rolls Series), I. 297.

¹⁵⁵ *Supra*, p. 22.

¹⁵⁶ Islip sanctioned higher rates in his own diocese than elsewhere in the southern province, note 99, *supra*. His first license was issued on November 27, 1362, just after the framing of the second *Effrenata*: Register, f. 189. Cf. *Reg. Edyndon*, pt. I., ff. 128-130; *Reg. Archbishop Whittlesey*, ff. 87-90. In the diocese of London, there is evidence for obedience to the constitution of 1362, *Calendar of the Letter Books of the City of London, Letter Book G*, p. 151.

¹⁵⁷ Rogers, II. 615, quoted by Richardson, p. 116; cf. *ibid.*, p. 112.

¹⁵⁸ *Reg. Islip*, f. 189: "Tamen post ordinacionem predictam tanta victualium caristia et raritas supervenit . . . ac pracipue in civitate Londonie [ut] de summa predicta capellani predicti . . . nequeunt commode sustentari"; *Reg. Bukynham*, quoted in note 106, *supra*: "Attendentes iustum esse et conforme rationi quod illi qui plus laborant plus de mercede recipere mereantur"; Richardson, p. 116.

¹⁵⁹ The denunciations of the prelates and of the poets are extraordinarily similar. The third book of *Vox Clamantis* contains serious charges against the

in denouncing the avarice of the unbeneficed clergy, especially the chantry priests, or whether in a century in which the wealth of the higher clergy has been attacked by reformers,¹⁶¹ we should find it somewhat ironic that pluralist¹⁶² princes of the church should preach apostolic poverty to their chaplains.¹⁶³

My concluding word is a suggestion in regard to the Great Revolt. It seems possible that the irritation caused in the minds of multitudes of the lower clergy by the restrictive measures imposed on them arbitrarily by their wealthy superiors may account in part at least for the presence of so many of them among the rebels.¹⁶⁴ Was Archbishop Sudbury's fate retribution for the last *Effrenata*?

BERTHA HAVEN PUTNAM.

secular clergy. One example must suffice: "Postquam dictum est de errore illorum qui in ecclesia beneficiati existunt, iam dicendum est de presbiteris stipendiariis . . .

Hos velut artifices cerno peditare per urbes,
Conductos precio sicut asella foro".

Latin Works (ed. Macaulay), p. 149.

¹⁶⁰ Text A (ed. Skeat), "Prologue", lines 80-83:

"Persones and parisch prestes playneth to heore Bisschops,
That heore parisch hath ben pore seth the Pestilence tyme,
And asketh leue and lycence at Londun to dwelle,
To singe ther for Simonye for seluer is swete."

Cf. Chaucer, Prologue to *Canterbury Tales*, lines 507-510 (ed. Gilman):

"He sette nat his benefice to hyre,
And leet his sheepe encombred in the myre,
And ran to Londoun un-to Saint Poules
To seken hym a chauntrie for soules."

¹⁶¹ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, II. 440-442; Hunt, *The English Church in the Middle Ages*, p. 209.

¹⁶² See papal mandates to Archbishop Langham, *Cal. Papal Letters*, IV. 12, 25, and Reg. Langham, *passim*.

¹⁶³ The attempts at restriction did not end with the fourteenth century, cf. *Rot. Parl.*, IV. 51-52, 121; *Statutes of the Realm*, II. 188, 2 Henry V., st. 2, c. 2; Wilkins, III. 213-214, 402-403.

¹⁶⁴ See Petit Dutaillis, *ubi supra*, note 153.

THE FRENCH OBJECTIVE IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION¹

THE majority of authorities would to-day, I believe, concede that but for our alliance with France the War of Independence would have ended without independence; and that but for the aid which France lent us secretly in the months preceding Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga we should hardly have become allies of His Most Christian Majesty, at least on anything like terms of equality. To emphasize the efficacy and indispensability of French aid in the Revolution is however only to throw into higher light its aspects of paradox: the oldest and most despotic monarchy of Europe making common cause with rebels against a sister monarchy; a government on the verge of bankruptcy deliberately inviting a war that, to all appearances certainly, it might have easily avoided! Ignorance of the risks involved might conceivably afford a partial explanation of the course taken by the French government in the years between 1776 and 1783, but in fact the explanation is little available. The possibility of peril in promoting rebellion, albeit in another's dominions, was clearly present to Louis's mind, while the unfitness of the royal exchequer for the burdens of war was pressed upon him by Turgot with all possible insistence.

I.

Bancroft explains French championship of American independence thus:

Many causes combined to produce the alliance of France and the American republic; but the force which brought all influences harmoniously together, overruling the timorous levity of Maurepas and the dull reluctance of Louis XVI., was the movement of intellectual freedom.²

The important element of truth in this theory is unquestionable. The direction and momentum of French popular sentiment established, to some extent certainly, the possibilities and limitations of French official action, and this sentiment was in turn to no inconsiderable extent the product of the liberalism of the age. Yet it

¹ The following article comprises the opening section of the writer's volume entitled *French Policy and the American Alliance*, which is about to be issued from the Princeton University Press.

² *History of the United States* (author's last revision), V. 256; see also pp. 264 ff.

seems clear that the idea that France ought to intervene, if opportunity offered, between England and her North American colonies, in behalf of the latter, came in the first instance not from the *salon* but from the Foreign Office. And it is not less clear that the precise policy pursued by the French government toward the United States from 1776 on was shaped not by philosophers but by professional diplomatists.³

Confining then our attention from the outset to the question of what were the *official* motives of French intervention, we have naturally to consider in the first instance the Count de Vergennes's attempt to represent his programme, which eventually became that of his government, as essentially defensive. Thus in his "Considérations" of March, 1776, which led directly to the policy of secret aid to the Americans, Vergennes urged upon the king and his associates the argument that, whether England subjugated her rebellious colonies or lost them, she would probably attack the French West Indies—in the one case in order to use the large forces she would have assembled, in the other, in order to indemnify herself.⁴ And in his "Mémoire" of July 23, 1777, urging an early alliance with the Americans, he took much the same line: The policy of secret aid had been well enough in its day, but it had not secured the Americans for France and Spain. If England could not speedily crush the American revolt she must make terms with it. Those whom she had failed to retain as subjects she would make allies, in a joint assault upon the riches of Peru and Mexico and the French Sugar Islands.⁵

That there were facts tending to give this line of argument a certain plausibility may be admitted: the known hatred of Chatham for the House of Bourbon, the supposed possibility (actually *nil*) that Chatham would be called to power by George III. if Lord North failed, the lack of scruple that had been shown by England in beginning the Seven Years' War without warning while negotiations were pending, the dissatisfaction of a section of English opinion with the terms of the peace of Paris.⁶ Also it may be admitted that the argument truly represented considerations that had measurable weight with its author. For Vergennes was a cautious, even though ambitious, statesman, and fond accordingly of that line of

³ See *infra*, §§ V. and VI.

⁴ Henri Doniol, *Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Établissement des États-Unis d'Amérique* (Paris, 1886-1892), I. 273-275.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II. 460, 462-463.

⁶ Expressions of Vergennes's distrust of Chatham will be found in Doniol, I. 61-62, 67-72. At the same time he admits in effect the unlikelihood of George III.'s calling him to power, *ibid.*, p. 62.

persuasion to action which emphasizes the countervailing risks of inaction. When, however, the question is fairly posed whether this argument throws any considerable light upon the real *objective* of French intervention in the Revolution, the answer is "no".

To begin with, there is, to say the least, something of an inconsistency in Vergennes's building an argument for an alliance with the Americans to protect French interests in the Caribbean upon the increment of danger resulting to those interests from his own policy of secret aid. And this inconsistency affords clue to a yet more striking one. In the summer of 1776, when he thought that France could count on the active assistance of Spain, Vergennes definitely proposed war with England and the proposition was tentatively ratified by the king and council.⁷ A little later, however, came the news of the fiasco on Long Island and Vergennes beat a precipitate retreat from his own programme.⁸ In other words, it would seem that the danger which, by the argument in the "Considérations", would menace France if England should subjugate her rebellious colonies was one that could be safely awaited in quiet, but that the one threatening from the contrary contingency was one that must be met half-way. Yet it was the latter contingency precisely which the policy of secret aid was designed to make sure!⁹

But again, while a British attack upon the Caribbean possessions would, of course, have forced France to come to their defense, it may be gravely doubted whether French official opinion held these possessions after 1763 in sufficient esteem to have warranted a policy that materially increased the likelihood of a serious war of which their security would be the main objective.¹⁰ Indeed, Vergennes himself declared on one occasion that the French West Indies could

⁷ "Considérations sur le parti qu'il convient à la France de prendre vis-à-vis de l'Angleterre dans la circonstance actuelle", August 31, 1776. *Ibid.*, pp. 567-575.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 613-621. A parallel case is furnished by the French secretary's change of front on the question of the Englishman Forth's mission to Paris in the late summer of 1777. At first Vergennes found this episode to be portentous of war at an early date. When, however, shortly after, the news arrived of Burgoyne's capture of Ticonderoga and of other disasters to the American arms, his alarm diminished perceptibly. *Ibid.*, II. 526-529, 534-536, 539, 551-555.

⁹ See the "Réflexions", *ibid.*, I. 247-248.

¹⁰ See the remarks of M. Abeille, quoted *infra*, § V. In the same connection one should also recall the pacifist attitude of the French government early in 1777 toward the question of defending Santo Domingo, the obvious explanation of it being the fear of arousing suspicion on the part of Great Britain that would prejudice the policy of secret aid. Doniol, II. 234-241, 253, 264-265, 272-275. Still more to the point is the fact that during the peace negotiations of 1782, the French government was ready and willing to surrender two of its most valuable possessions in the West Indies, Guadeloupe and Dominica, to Great Britain in order to obtain Gibraltar for Spain. *Ibid.*, V. 220.

offer but slight temptation to English cupidity, that England already had enough such possessions.¹¹ But finally, there is every reason to believe that both France and Spain could at any time before 1778 have obtained from England, in return for a pledge of neutrality, a specific guaranty of their American holdings, and in fact the programme proposed by the Spanish government in 1777 incorporated this very idea. Nor can there be any question that England would have hesitated to violate such a guaranty so long as peace continued on the Continent of Europe. None the less, Vergennes from the first consistently repelled all such propositions.¹²

To no small extent certainly, Vergennes's attempt to give his programme a defensive mask is to be accounted for by purely propagandist reasons. He had before him from the beginning the two-fold necessity of winning his own king and the king of Spain to his side. It is, therefore, a circumstance of no little significance that in the first formulation of his position toward the American revolt, in the "Réflexions" prepared by his secretary Gérard de Rayneval in December, 1775, the notion of danger threatening from England is distinctly subordinated to what is throughout essentially a programme of aggression. But for this tone the king, despite the missionary work of Beaumarchais,¹³ was, it would seem, hardly prepared; and in the "Considérations" a few weeks later the conscientious scruples of His Most Christian Majesty and His Catholic Majesty are pointed to with some ostentation.¹⁴ Moreover, in the "Considérations" Vergennes was confronted with the task of demonstrating the superior urgency of his diplomatic programme to that of Turgot's programme of financial retrenchment, and this task could *only* be performed by representing war with England as virtually inevitable.¹⁵

And unquestionably it must be conceded that this sort of propa-

¹¹ *Doniol*, II. 643-644.

¹² Both at the end of 1776 and in the spring of 1777, the British government suggested tentatively a common disarmament on the part of England, France, and Spain. *Doniol*, II. 145-154, 232. Vergennes however had from the first been averse to seeking any sort of understanding with England, *ibid.*, I. 51-52. For Floridablanca's programme and Vergennes's attitude toward it, see *ibid.*, II. 264, 293-295. See also Vergennes's argument against accepting the offer, apparently made by Forth, in August, 1777, of a British guaranty of French and Spanish possessions, *ibid.*, pp. 528-529.

¹³ See John Durand, *New Materials for the History of the American Revolution* (New York, 1889), pp. 44-86.

¹⁴ "Si les dispositions de ces deux princes étaient guerrières, s'ils étaient disposés à se livrer à l'impulsion de leurs intérêts." *Doniol*, I. 275.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 280-284.

ganda proved, at critical junctures, extremely effective with Louis;¹⁶ but that this circumstance, on the other hand, is not to be accorded undue weight is proved by the countervailing one that the Spanish government, to whom the argument was also addressed, treated it, once the danger that had at first threatened of war with Portugal was removed, with conspicuous levity—and this notwithstanding Vergennes's insistence that Spain's empire in America furnished England tenfold the temptation that the meagre remnants of French holdings did.¹⁷ In short, while the argument that England designed to attack her Caribbean possessions assisted materially in bringing France into the Revolution by tending to minimize the weightiest argument against such a project, it does not follow that the defense of these possessions furnished the principal purpose of French action. The central core of Vergennes's programme from the first was *aid* to the Americans in the achievement of their *independence*; and the prospect of American independence necessarily brought into view objectives which far overshadowed the security of the French West Indies, either momentary or permanent.

French intervention in the Revolution was in short determined by motives of "aggression" rather than of "defense"—at any rate in what used to be the accepted significance of these terms, before the present war had obliterated so many distinctions. That is to say, France's main purpose was the upsetting of the *status quo* in certain particulars rather than its preservation in certain others. But in what particulars? That is to say, was her objective territory or commerce, or was it something less tangible than either of these?

II.

The possibility that it was territory is raised by the contention of Professor Turner that France hoped in the Revolution to replace England in Canada and Spain in Louisiana. In support of this thesis Professor Turner adduces, first, the testimony of Godoy, "the

¹⁶ Especially after Saratoga. For the data which Vergennes brought to bear upon the king to procure his decision for an alliance with the United States at this juncture, see Doniol, II. 625 ff., 717 ff. Rumors of impending negotiations between the American commissioners and the British representatives and utterances of British parliamentary orators of the Opposition (see *Parliamentary History*, XIX. 662 ff.) were the principal items. Vergennes's manipulation of this evidence is palpably disingenuous, as I shall show elsewhere. The reaction of the king to ministerial alarmism, which was effectively supplemented by the similar efforts of Beaumarchais, is indicated by Vergennes in a despatch to Montmorin dated January 8, 1778, after the alliance had been determined upon: "Ce n'est point l'influence de ses ministres qui a décidé le roi, c'est l'évidence des faits, c'est la certitude morale du péril." Doniol, II. 734.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 643. Spain's attitude is shown by her course.

Prince of Peace", that after the war was over, Vergennes, counting upon the close union between France and Spain, sought to induce the latter, "already so rich in possessions beyond the sea, to give to France her ancient colony"; secondly, the fact that during the war Vergennes appeared anxious "to protect the interests of Spain in the country between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi"; and thirdly, a document published in Paris in 1802 under the caption *Mémoire Historique et Politique sur la Louisiane par M. de Vergennes*.¹⁸

Upon closer scrutiny each item of this evidence must for one reason or other be disallowed. The reliability of the testimony of Godoy, who did not come into power until six years after Vergennes's death, is in itself dubious, but even if it be accepted at face value it says nothing of Vergennes's intentions *before* and *during* the Revolution. Vergennes's attitude *during* that period toward Spain's claims to the territory between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi is sufficiently accounted for by his feeling that it was necessary to harmonize the conflicting interests of the United States and Spain, each of whom was in alliance with France against England. The document published in 1802, though it may *possibly* date from the Revolution, was not the work of Vergennes nor of any one who spoke for him. Not only does the programme that it proposes directly traverse, in its reference to Canada, the pledge of His Most Christian Majesty in article VI. of the treaty of alliance, renouncing "forever the possession . . . of any part of the continent" that had lately belonged to Great Britain, but it materially conflicts with the policy which Professor Turner himself attributes to Vergennes of supporting Spain's claims in the region between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi. The latter policy was clearly designed to allay Spain's alarm at the prospects of American independence. The programme urged in the *Mémoire* of 1802 proposed the deliberate aggravation of this alarm as the easiest means of inducing Spain to relinquish Louisiana to the stronger hands of France.¹⁹

¹⁸ *American Historical Review*, X. 249 ff.

¹⁹ See the *Mémoire*, pp. 25-30. Other considerations that forbid the attribution of this document to Vergennes or official associates of his are the following: It is to be noted that while the anonymous editor of the *Mémoire* assumes to vouch for "the style, the thoughts" of the document as being those of the French secretary, he says nothing of a signature, nor does any appear in the published form. The *Mémoire* is also devoid of certain distinctive marks of a French official document addressed to royalty, the most obvious consisting in the failure of the writer (or compiler) ever to refer to France and Spain by the titles of their Bourbon rulers.

If we are to rely upon the silence of the *Inventaire Sommaire*, no memoir

But if France's objective was not territory, perhaps it was commerce. Unquestionably there was a wide-spread belief in France early in the Revolution, which was appealed to not only by the American envoys but by Vergennes himself on occasion, that if France assisted the United States to their independence, American

on Louisiana exists in the French archives of the date to which the *Mémoire* published in 1802 is assigned by its editor, though several are to be found there of an earlier date from which this one might have been fabricated, and to one of these the editor makes specific reference in a foot-note. Furthermore, the fact that the *Mémoire* of 1802 was, if at this point we are to follow the editor, found among Vergennes's own papers, of itself casts doubt on its ever having been presented to the king.

In connection with his statement that "both French and American bibliographers have accepted" the "genuineness" of the *Mémoire*, Professor Turner cites only the *Voyage à la Louisiane* of Baudry des Lozières. Yet Baudry, while praising the *Mémoire* for "plusieurs de ses vues qui sont très-sages", directly challenges the assertion that it was the work of Vergennes. "If", says he, "M. de Vergennes has any part in these mémoires, it is only a very small part." But perhaps the most remarkable feature of the document under consideration is (assuming it to date from before 1783) the ignorance it discloses on the part of its author that by the treaty of 1763 Florida belonged to Great Britain (see pp. 26 and 30). The Duke of Newcastle is reported to have once addressed a despatch to "the Governor of the Island of Massachusetts". But Vergennes was neither a British peer nor a spoilsman in office, but a man noted among his contemporaries for the range and accuracy of his information in the field of diplomacy. It may be safely assumed, therefore, that he was fully aware that France's closest ally had lost an extensive province by the peace of Paris and had been compensated by France herself with a still more extensive one. Besides, as is shown below, the *Mémoire* of 1802, considered as an entity, must by any assumption date from a period later than early January, 1778. Before this, however, Holker, in instructions dated November 25, 1777, was informed by the French Foreign Office that his government wished to see England left in possession of Florida, Nova Scotia, and Canada. Doniol, II. 616. Upon careful examination of it I am convinced that the *Mémoire* of 1802 comprises two earlier documents loosely joined together by the author of the short address "Au Roi", chapter I., and certain paragraphs of chapter X., of the published document. The first of these two earlier documents comprises most of chapters II.-X. of the *Mémoire* of 1802 and was written before the outbreak of the Seven Years' War, to refute Great Britain's claim to the region then in dispute between France and Great Britain. It closed with a plan of compromise in the form of a proposed treaty between the two nations, which plan is touched up at points by the compiler of the 1802 document. The second of the earlier documents was written after the events described in pages 162 to 169 of the published volume—i. e., about 1769—to protest against the then recent cession of Louisiana to Spain. The entire separateness of the two documents is attested by the words with which the second one opens ("Ce mémoire a pour but", etc., p. 115), by the vastly different styles of the two documents, and by diverse spellings of certain proper names. (In the latter connection compare pp. 57 and 150-151; also pp. 61 and 172.) When, then, was this compilation made? Dismissing the editor's assertion that the document was the work of Vergennes, but taking the document itself at face value, it was brought together after the outbreak of the War of Independence (chapters I. and X.), but before the treaty of alliance recognizing American independence was known (the United States are always referred to as "colonies")

trade would turn forthwith to French ports.²⁰ Yet squarely confronted with the theory that this belief had been material in determining his programme, Vergennes unqualifiedly rejected the notion. "They perhaps think at Madrid", he wrote after the alliance had been determined upon, "that the interest of acquiring a new trade had principally decided us." But he repelled the suggestion thus:

This motive, assessed at its true worth, can be only a very feeble accessory. American trade, *viewed in its entirety and subject to the monopoly of the mother-country, was undoubtedly a great object of interest to the latter and an important source of the growth of her industry and power.* But American trade, thrown open as it is to be henceforth to the avidity of all nations, will be for France a very petty consideration.²¹

These words of Vergennes have, however, something more than their merely negative value; they bring us in fact to the very threshold of the subject of our quest. Official thinking about trade was moulded in the eighteenth century, in vast part, by the categories of what is called "the mercantile system", and it is the significance of the words just quoted that they prove Vergennes to have been of this school. The salient features of mercantilism mark it at once as a system of *state-craft* rather than of *economics*, at least in any modern sense of these terms. In the first place, wealth was identified with that form of it in which, in a period when the machinery of public credit was rudimentary and the usual cement of international alliances was provided by cash subsidies, it was most available for political purposes. Again, the welfare of the subject was assessed for its contribution to the power of the state. Finally, the power of the state was evaluated in terms fur-

and "provinces" and on p. 180 the compiler speaks of "strengthening the peace" between France and Great Britain); also during a warlike situation on the Continent (pp. 27 and 103, by the compiler). But this last condition can be satisfied, for the period between 1775 and 1781, only by supposing the references just cited to have been to the events leading up to the so-called War of the Bavarian Succession. If, then, the *Mémoire* of 1802 is to be assigned, as a whole, to the period of the American Revolution, it must be placed between late January and the middle of March, 1778. We know that, in the months preceding France's intervention, numerous memoirs were transmitted to the Foreign Office, and the *Mémoire* of 1802 may therefore represent one from a sheaf of similar productions. Doniol, I. 242, foot-note. Mr. Paul C. Phillips, on the other hand, conjectures plausibly that the document published in 1802 owes its existence to an effort to bolster up Napoleon's then recent acquisition of Louisiana, *The West in the Diplomacy of the American Revolution* (Univ. of Ill., 1914), pp. 30-32, foot-note. For Vergennes's appreciation that France must attempt no conquests on the North American continent, see Doniol, III. 570.

²⁰ *Deane Papers* (N. Y. Hist. Soc. Colls., 1886), I. 181, 184 ff., 207; Doniol, I. 244.

²¹ Doniol, III. 140. Madrid received its impression from Aranda. Aranda to Floridablanca, January 31, 1778, the Sparks MSS., Harvard University Library.

nished by the doctrine of the "balance of power". But granting these premises and it followed, first, that the principal advantage to be sought from trade was a balance payable in coin or bullion, and secondly, that the most desirable branch of trade was that which was most susceptible of manipulation to produce such a balance—in other words, *colonial trade*. For subject as it was, within the laws of nature, to the unlimited control of the mother-country, the colony could be compelled to obtain all its manufactures from the mother-country and to return therefor raw materials and a cash balance. At the very least, by furnishing the mother-country raw materials which she would otherwise have to purchase from her political rivals, the colony could be made to contribute directly to the maintenance of a favorable *balance of trade* and, *pro tanto*, to that of a favorable *balance of power* against those rivals.²²

²² A good general account of the rise of mercantilism and of its principles is to be found in C. F. Bastable's *Commerce of Nations* (1899), ch. IV. For an admirable statement of the connection which mercantilist theory and policy established between colonies and commerce, see Professor C. M. Andrews, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XX. 43 ff. "During the greater part of our colonial period commerce and the colonies were correlative terms, unthinkable each without the other", *ibid.*, p. 43. See also the same writer's article in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XX. 539 ff., entitled "Anglo-French Commercial Rivalry, 1700-1750". "France and England were fairly matched rivals, in that their policies were the same, to acquire colonies in the interest of trade, shipping, and manufactures, to exclude the foreigner from the colonial market, and to make the welfare and wealth of the mother state the first and chief object of the efforts of all, colonies and mother-country alike." *Ibid.*, p. 546. It will be noted that Professor Andrews makes *welfare* the objective of the mercantile policy, but *power* would perhaps be the better word even for English mercantilism. Note the following passage quoted by Professor Andrews from Otis Little's *The State of the Trade of the Northern Colonies Considered* (1748), pp. 8-9: "As every state in Europe seems desirous of increasing its Trade, and the Acquisition of Wealth enlarges the Means of power, it is necessary, in order to preserve an Equality with them, that this Kingdom extends its Commerce in proportion; but to acquire a Superiority, due Encouragement ought to be given to such of its Branches, as will most effectually enrich its Inhabitants. As trade enables the Subject to support the Administration of Government, the lessening or destroying that of a Rival, has the same effect, as if this Kingdom had enlarged the Sources of its own Wealth. . . . But, as an Ascendancy is to be gained by checking the Growth of theirs, as well as by the Increase of our own, whenever one of these happens to be the Consequence of the other to this Nation, its Figure and Reputation will rise to a greater Height than ever." *Ibid.*, p. 543, foot-note. In other words, the mercantilist looked beyond the *welfare* of the subject to the *power* and reputation of the state, and these he measured by the standard set by the doctrine of the balance of power. The same point is also brought out by a passage from Postlethwayt's *Britain's Commercial Interest Explained and Improved* (1757): "I next enter upon the general principles, whereon the balance of trade is founded . . . the consideration of which is earnestly recommended to the public regard, in order to throw the balance of trade so effectually into the hands of Great Britain, as to put the constant balance of power in Europe into her hands." *Ibid.*, II. 551. See also the *Gentleman's Magazine*, XII. 589 (November 1742): "Now, that Money is the

Applying, however, these considerations to the case of French intervention in the American Revolution, we have at once to note that by the treaty of amity and commerce all privileges of trade were to be "mutual" and none given France but what the United States were left at liberty to grant to any other nation, while by the treaty of alliance, its "essential and direct end" was stated to be the achievement of American *independence* not only in *matters of government* but of *commerce also*.²³ In other words, we discover that the *real* commercial motive underlying the alliance was not the hope of *building up French trade*—which it was supposed could hardly be done effectively or advantageously without the machinery of monopoly—but the *breaking down of British trade at the point at which, by mercantilist premises, it most immediately supported British power*. The commercial motive merges itself with a larger political motive: the *enfeeblement of England*.

The lesson drawn by Englishmen from their magnificent triumph in the Seven Years' War is to be found in the famous lament of Chatham on the news of Saratoga: America "was, indeed, the fountain of our wealth, the nerve of our strength, the nursery and basis of our naval power".²⁴ But what should be especially noted about these words is that they refer to the part of America then in revolt, that is to *continental* America. The circumstance is one that would have been quite impossible before 1760, when the emphasis was still on colonies as sources of supply and when, consequently, British opinion, in appraising the two portions of British America, gave the invariable preference to the island and tropical portion. The treaty of Paris, however, signalizes a new point of view. Not only had Sinews of War, is become a proverbial Expression; and, with Respect to Great Britain, it is notorious we can do nothing without it. Almost all we did in the last Struggle with the Grand Monarch, was by the Dint of Money. If we had Numbers of Allies, we were obliged to pay them all; and whereas every other Power in the Confederacy run into Arrears with their Engagements, we not only made good our Proportions, but often exceeded them. . . . But, to suppose, what is impossible, that we still roll in Riches, who is to join with us in this mighty Enterprise, of wresting the *Balance of Europe* out of the strong Hand that hath lately held it?" See further the index of this same periodical under titles, "Balance of Power" and "France", for other instructive passages along the same lines, especially in the volumes covering the years from 1737 to 1742. Naturally in France, where the dynastic principle was the exclusive basis of the state, the political aspect of mercantilism was predominant; see *infra*.

²³ Treaty of amity and commerce, preamble; treaty of alliance, art. II. See also the American commissioners' letter of February 8, 1778, to the President of Congress, Wharton (1889), II. 490-491.

²⁴ Speech of November 18, 1777, *Parliamentary History*, XIX. 365, foot-note. See to the same effect Burke's speech of November 27, 1781, *ibid.*, XXII. 721-722. See also the opening paragraph of Deane's memoir on the Commerce of America and its Importance to Europe, cited above, *Deane Papers*, I. 184.

continental America made direct contributions to the military forces of the mother-country in the course of the war just closed, but its increasing importation of British manufactures in exchange for raw materials now netted a favorable balance that quite eclipsed the calculable benefits from the West Indian trade. Furthermore, inasmuch as the colonial trade had always been regarded as the essential matrix of British naval strength, popular esteem naturally turned increasingly to that branch of this trade which promised a progressive extension. The upshot of these developments is to be seen in the decision of the British government, registered in the treaty of Paris, to retain Canada instead of Guadeloupe and Martinique from its French conquests. No doubt the decision was in part motivated by a desire to meet the demands of New England; but the discussion that attended it proves that it is also to be regarded as a deliberate re-appraisal by England of the relative value of the two sections of her western empire.²⁵

The reaction of France, in turn, to the lesson of the treaty of Paris was conditioned in the first instance by the plain impossibility of further competition with Great Britain in the field of colonization, at least so long as British naval strength remained predominant. On the other hand, however, the doctrine of the balance of power which, as I have already pointed out, was the political obverse of mercantilism, emphasized the notion that the grand desideratum for a state was not so much a certain absolute quantum of power as a certain rank of power in relation to other states, and particularly those states which it counted its usual rivals—that, in short, *power was relative*. But this premise assumed, the opportunity presented France by the American revolt was a deduction at once inevitable and irresistible. Choiseul's early perception of it, we shall note presently. At this juncture our interest is in the point of view of Vergennes, the official sponsor of French intervention. Fortunately it is attested both in his despatches and in his more formal memoirs again and again: England was France's ancient and hereditary enemy. The essential basis of English power was English commerce and English naval strength. The most important source of these, in turn, was England's colonial empire, and especially her holdings in North America. The dis severance once and for all time of the connection between England and her rebellious provinces would deprive her of the greatest single source of power and, by the same token, elevate the power of the House of Bourbon against its most dangerous and unscrupulous rival. To achieve that

²⁵ For the matter of this paragraph, see George Louis Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765* (New York, 1907), ch. IV.

would be worth a war otherwise "somewhat disadvantageous".²⁶

Moreover there would also be certain collateral benefits. For one thing, from being an ever-available base of operations against the French West Indies, the new nation would be converted into their joint protector "forever".²⁷ Again, from being a beneficiary and so a prop to those rules of naval warfare by which Great Britain bore so hard upon the commercial interests both of her enemies and of neutrals, the new nation would be pledged to a more liberal system.²⁸ Yet again, by leaving England her non-rebellious provinces in North America, a certain portion of her strength and attention would be permanently diverted from the European balance to the maintenance of a minor balance in the Western Hemisphere.²⁹ However, these considerations too connect themselves, and rather directly, with the logic of the doctrine of the balance of power. Thus the real question raised by our search for the main objective of French intervention in the Revolution becomes the question of *the main objective, in the thinking of French statesmen of a balance of power favorable to France.* The answer to that question reveals the third dimension of French diplomacy of the Old Régime—a certain dynastic tradition.

III.

The diplomatic object of this crown has been and will always be to enjoy in Europe that rôle of leadership which accords with its antiquity, its worth, and its greatness; to abase every power which shall attempt to become superior to it, whether by endeavoring to usurp its possessions, or by arrogating to itself an unwarranted pre-eminence, or finally by seeking to diminish its influence and credit in the affairs of the world at large.³⁰

In these words of the French Foreign Office, penned in 1756 to justify the Diplomatic Revolution, is sketched the picture that dominated French diplomacy throughout the declining years of the Old Régime. In "the fair days of Louis XIV." the picture had been a reality, which, however, that monarch's later aggressions had gone far to shatter. Then Cardinal Fleury had come forward with his

²⁶ See especially the following passages: the "Réflexions" of December, 1775, Doniol, I. 243-244; the "Considérations" of November 5, 1776, *ibid.*, pp. 686-687; the "Mémoire" of January 7, 1777, referred to briefly in the text, *ibid.*, II. 118; the despatch of March 11, 1777, *ibid.*, II. 239; the despatch of May 23, 1777, *ibid.*, p. 295; the "Mémoire" of July 23, 1777, *ibid.*, p. 461; the despatch of December 13, 1777, *ibid.*, pp. 643-644.

²⁷ Treaty of alliance, art. XI.

²⁸ Treaty of amity and commerce, arts. XV. ff.

²⁹ Doniol, III. 156-158, 557; IV. 74.

³⁰ *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France depuis les Traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Révolution Française*, I., Autriche, p. 356; see also p. 383.

Système de Conservation by which France pledged Europe that in return for *influence* she would forego extension of *dominion* and that she would devote the influence vouchsafed her on these terms to the cause of Europe's peace.³¹

The success of the System for France's diplomatic position was astonishing. On the eve of the War of the Austrian Succession the elder branch of the House of Bourbon, the protector of Christian interests in the East, of Poland, Sweden, Turkey, Saxony, Sardinia, the German princes, of Don Carlos of Naples, of the emperor himself, and the ally of the maritime powers and of Spain, was the nodal point of every combination of powers in Europe. At the same time His Most Christian Majesty's services as mediator were sought, now by Austria and Spain, now by Russia and Turkey, now by Austria and Russia, now by Spain and Portugal, now by England and Spain.³² "Thanks to Cardinal Fleury", exclaimed the advocate Barbier, "the king is the master and arbiter of Europe".³³ The aged Fleury himself complacently compared the position of France to what it had been "at the most brilliant epoch of Louis XIV.'s reign".³⁴ Frederick II., just ascending the throne of Prussia, found "the Courts of Vienna, Madrid, and Stockholm in a sort of tutelage" to Versailles.³⁵ The Sultan's ambassador at the coronation of Charles VII. apostrophized Louis XV. as "Grand Monarque", "King of Christian Kings", "Emperor of the Franks".³⁶ The enemies of Walpole, who, in return for commercial favors to England, had willingly connived in the extension of French influence, declared that England had been made a cat's-paw of, that the House of Bourbon was at the summit of power, that the balance of power was at an end.³⁷

³¹ M. de Flassan, *Histoire Générale et Raisonnée de la Diplomatie Française depuis la Fondation de la Monarchie jusqu'à la Fin du Règne de Louis XVI.* (second ed., Paris, 1811, 7 vols.), V. 167 ff. On the general principles and outlook of French diplomacy following the death of Louis XIV. and the orientation of Vergennes's policy in these, see Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, pt. I, *Les Mœurs Politiques et les Traditions* (third ed., Paris, 1893), pp. 331-336, 297-304. For some excellent eighteenth-century expressions of the "Tradition of Grandeur", dating from Louis XIV., see Abbé Raynal's *Philosophical and Political History of the Settlements*, etc. (trans. by Justament, London, 1777), IV. 506 ff.; V. 457 ff.; also Anquetil's *Motifs des Guerres et des Traités de Paix de la France* (Paris, 1797), pp. 187 ff.

³² For these data see Lavissee and Rambaud, *Histoire Générale*, VII. 119-160.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

³⁴ *Recueil des Instructions*, I. 246.

³⁵ *Posthumous Works of Frederick II.* (trans. by Holcroft, London, 1789), I. 16.

³⁶ *Gentleman's Magazine*, XII. 54 (1742).

³⁷ See the "Debate in the Lords on Carteret's Motion for the Removal of Sir Robert Walpole", especially Carteret's own speeches. *Parl. Hist.*, XI. 1047 ff.

Nor did the War of the Austrian Succession, rising like a drama to its climax in the stage-triumph of Fontenoy,³⁸ though obviously a defeat for salient principles of Fleury's System,³⁹ signify any lessening of France's influence on the Continent in the estimate of those who then guided her destinies. Foremost of these was the Marquis d'Argenson, who became in 1744 the king's secretary of state for foreign affairs on a platform, so to say, interpreting the rôle of France among nations in the light of the rising philosophy of the age. The period of conquests, Argenson declared—though unhappily not of war—was at an end, and France especially had reason to be content with her greatness. Those therefore who spoke of perfecting the boundaries of France or forming leagues for her defense were ill advised. "Our neighbors have everything to fear from us—we nothing from them." The only alliances which France should form should be "for the purpose of repressing the ambitious", and should be made only with lesser states, "such as Portugal, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Venice, Modena, Switzerland, Bavaria, Prussia, Saxony, etc." In brief, France was in the position to give the law to Europe, so it be a just law. Let her, then, "sustain the feeble and oppressed" and in her part as "paternal protector", "arrest disorders for many centuries".⁴⁰ In 1748 France, by the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, restored her conquests of the war just closed. Sinful Paris pronounced it "a beastly peace". The royal ministers, on the other hand, contrasting His Most Christian Majesty with those rulers who were forced by necessity to seek only their own aggrandizement and were ever masking selfish designs with a pretended solicitude for the balance of power, defended the treaty as marking precisely France's station and magnanimity.⁴¹

³⁸ See Voltaire's description in his "Précis du Siècle de Louis XV.", *Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris, 1792), XXI. 129-148. Note especially his words on p. 148: "Ce qui est aussi remarquable que cette victoire, c'est que le premier soin du roi de France fût de faire écrire le jour même à l'abbé de la Ville . . . qu'il ne demandait pour prix de ses conquêtes que la pacification de l'Europe."

³⁹ For the policy of a friendly understanding with the maritime powers and Austria. In his instructions of December 11, 1737, to the Marquis de Mirepoix, Fleury suggests definitely a *rapprochement* between the Houses of Bourbon and Hapsburg. *Recueil des Instructions*, I. 245-246.

⁴⁰ *Journal et Mémoires du Marquis d'Argenson* (ed. Ratheray, Paris, 1859), I. 325-326, 371-372; IV. 131 ff. See also Sainte-Beuve, "Argenson", *Causeries du Lundi*. The idealistic, not to say sentimental, character of Argenson's point of view is illustrated by his "maxim", "le roi aime mieux être trompé que de tromper".

⁴¹ For the Parisian estimate of the peace, see Lavissee and Rambaud, *op. cit.*, VII. 204. Argenson testifies to the popular criticism evoked by the peace, thus: "Le français aime la gloire et l'honneur, de sorte qu'après les premiers moments

And thus much for the successful aspect of Fleury's System: it gave France for the time being the preponderance in Europe and it accustomed her statesmen to claim for her in relation to the minor states of the Continent in general the rôle which the treaty of Westphalia had conferred upon her in terms, in relation to the lesser members of the Germanic body.⁴² Unfortunately the System had its Achilles's heel, to wit, its indifference to the decline of French sea-power and to the rise of English sea-power. The earliest protest against an attitude so obviously defiant of the tenets of mercantilism came from Fleury's own associate, the young Count de Maurepas, who between 1730 and 1740 headed the Department of the Marine. Now in an official report on the state of the marine, now in a letter purporting to emanate from the shade of Louis XIV., now in a memoir on the condition of French commerce abroad, Maurepas reiterated again and again the favorite premises of his school and their obvious deductions for France: Commerce that kept gold at home and drew it from abroad was a source of public greatness. Foreign trade was the essential root of naval strength. Against no two states in the world could France so profitably turn her arms as against Holland and England. The latter moreover was an active menace to Bourbon interests in all parts of the world. It behooved His Most Christian Majesty "to put to flight this usurping race" and to curtail the commerce which already rendered "these ancient enemies of his crown almost the masters of the fate of Europe".⁴³ It is not impertinent to recall that at the outbreak of the American Revolution the author of these words was His Most Christian Majesty's chief minister.

The warning thus sounded was soon re-echoed by others. In a council of ministers shortly before France's entrance into the War of the Austrian Succession, the Duke de Noailles opposed this step with vigor and insight. England's system, said he, is obvious. "It is to arrive at supreme power by superiority of wealth, and America alone can make smooth the road for her." It could be predicted at the outset that His Britannic Majesty would not waste his substance in Germany, but would seize the opportunity afforded by a war on the Continent to wage war for his own purposes in America. France's real concern should be for her colonies, and only motives of vainglory could distract her attention to the empire.⁴⁴ Two years

de joie de la paix conclue, tout le public est tombé dans la consternation de la médiocrité des conditions." For the ministerial view-point, see *Recueil des Instructions*, I. 286 ff., 310 ff.

⁴² On France's guarantee of the treaty of Westphalia, see *ibid.*, p. 208.

⁴³ Maurepas, *Mémoires* (ed. Soulavie, Paris, 1792), III. 93 ff., 161 ff., 194 ff., especially 205-206 and 241.

⁴⁴ Anquetil, *Motifs des Guerres*, p. 376.

later Deslandes's *Essai sur la Marine et le Commerce* appeared, addressed to "those at the Helm". In these pages one will find proclaimed the theory to be made familiar to us a hundred and fifty years later through Admiral Mahan's famous work, that from the beginnings of history the marine has been a decisive factor in the rise and fall of states. And particularly, Deslandes went on to argue, had the greatness of France always rested on a strong navy. The restoration of the marine was therefore the first duty of French statesmen. Its neglect could lead only to calamity.⁴⁵

The mercantilist propaganda, aptly confirmed by the events of the War of the Austrian Succession, began moreover in time to show promise of fruition. Even Argenson, despite his general complacency, yet gave warning that English ambition, fraud, and aggressiveness in the way of trade, and the prosperity of the English colonies, menaced Europe with the prospect of British dominion "of the seas and of all the commerce in the world".⁴⁶ Saint-Contest, who became secretary of state for foreign affairs in 1751, was of like opinion, holding that, on account of her naval strength, England even then exerted a greater influence in European concerns than France. At the same time he contended that naval strength was a highly vulnerable sort of strength, and that, with prudent measures, it would be easy for France to reduce Great Britain to her proper rank.⁴⁷ Meantime in 1749 Rouillé had become minister of the marine. Under his administration and that of his successor Machault the navy was brought to comparative efficiency, as was attested by the capture of Minorca in June, 1756.

Unfortunately the Seven Years' War, thus auspiciously begun for France, was not long to remain predominantly a war with England, to be waged on the sea for commerce and colonies. The simple fact is that with the *haute noblesse* the army was popular and the navy, for all the zeal of the mercantilists, was not. The prejudices of the nobles moreover fell in with the pique of the king at what he considered the ingratitude and faithlessness of his *protégé*, the King of Prussia, in making a defensive alliance with England. In vain was it urged upon Louis that the treaty of Westminster, far from implying hostility on Frederick's part toward His Most Christian Majesty, was really a matter for thanksgiving, in that it guaranteed peace on the Continent and, by the same sign, a

⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*, *passim*. See also the same writer's *Essai sur la Marine des Anciens et Particulièrement sur leurs Vaisseaux de Guerre* (Paris, 1748). Curiously enough Admiral Mahan seems not to have been aware of Deslandes's works.

⁴⁶ *Journal et Mémoires*, I. 372.

⁴⁷ Flassan, *op. cit.*, VI. 14-16; *Recueil des Instructions*, XII.² (*Espagne*, pt. III.), pp. 298 ff.

free hand for France in India and America. By the first treaty of Versailles, of May 1, 1756, the famous Diplomatic Revolution was effected by a defensive alliance between France and Austria. Even so, the general opinion at first was that this arrangement also was calculated to conserve the peace of Europe. On August 29, 1756, however, Frederick invaded Saxony and the war thus precipitated speedily became general. By the second treaty of Versailles, May 1, 1757, the resources of France were placed at the disposal of the House of Austria.⁴⁸

IV.

The fortunes of the ensuing war it is, of course, unnecessary for us to follow further than to note that for France they were *misfortunes*. These were the days when Mme. du Deffand rechristened France "Madame Job". Cardinal Bernis, minister of foreign affairs and so official sponsor for the Austrian alliance, was soon in the depths. "Everything is going to pieces", he wrote. "No sooner does one succeed in propping the building at one corner than it crumbles at another." France "touches the very last period of decay". She "has neither generals nor ministers". "Ah that God would send us a directing will or some one who had one! I would be his valet if he wished it, and gladly!"⁴⁹

In Choiseul, who succeeded Bernis in November, 1758, the directing will was found and the mercantilist point of view again assured utterance in the royal council. It is true that Choiseul's first official act was to renew with the empress the onerous engagements of his predecessor, but to this he was fairly committed by the circumstances in which he had taken office.⁵⁰ Presently we find him declaring to the Austrian court with entire candor that the war with England involved French power and honor more directly than did the struggle on the Continent. Indeed, he proceeded, the interest of Austria herself demanded the preservation of France's sea-power. For "this it is", said he, "which enables His Majesty to sustain numerous armies for the defense of his allies, as it is the maritime power of England which to-day arms so many enemies against them and against France".⁵¹ And the same point of view again found expression in his despatch of March 21, 1759, to Havrin-court, the king's ambassador at Stockholm.

⁴⁸ Lavissee and Rambaud, *op. cit.*, VII. 217-220; Richard Waddington, *Louis XV. et le Renversement des Alliances* (Paris, 1896), pp. 249-262, 358-517.

⁴⁹ Lavissee and Rambaud, *op. cit.*, VII. 244-245; Richard Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, II. 432-433; Sainte-Beuve, "Bernis", *Causeries du Lundi*.

⁵⁰ Waddington, *op. cit.*, vol. II., ch. VIII., and III. 452-454.

⁵¹ "Instructions to the Count de Choiseul", June, 1759, *Recueil des Instructions*, I. 386.

We must not deceive ourselves. *The true balance of power really resides in commerce and in America.* The war in Germany, even though it should be waged with better success than at present, will not prevent the evils that are to be feared from the great superiority of the English on the sea. The king will take up arms in vain. For if he does not have a care, he will see his allies forced to become, not the paid auxiliaries of England, but her tributaries, and France will need many a Richelieu and Colbert to recover, in the face of her enemies, the equality which she is in peril of losing.⁵²

In October came the news of the fall of Quebec. "The balance of power", wrote Choiseul to Ossun, the king's ambassador at Madrid, "is destroyed in America, and we shall presently possess there only Santo Domingo. France, in the actual posture of affairs, cannot be regarded as a commercial power, which is to say that she cannot be regarded as a power of the first order."⁵³

Choiseul now set himself the task, failing a peace with England on reasonable terms, of restoring to the war its original character of a contest with that power for commerce, colonies, and naval supremacy. Auspiciously for his purpose, Don Carlos, a much better Bourbon than Ferdinand VI. had ever been, was now Charles III. of Spain. In negotiations during the summer of 1761 between France and England Choiseul seized the opportunity of championing certain claims of Spain against His Britannic Majesty, which however were rejected by Pitt in terms that aroused not only Charles's indignation but positive apprehensions for his own colonial empire.⁵⁴ The result was that on August 15, 1761, the second Family Compact, making France and Spain practically one power for all warlike purposes, was signed at Paris.

The intention [runs the preamble of this document] of His Most Christian Majesty and of His Catholic Majesty, in contracting the engagements which they assume by this treaty, is to perpetuate in their descendants the sentiments of Louis XIV. of glorious memory, their common august ancestor, and to establish forever a solemn monument of reciprocal interest which should be the basis of the desires of their courts and of the prosperity of their royal families.

The treaty itself announced its basic principle to be that "whoever attacked one crown, attacked the other". Thus, when at war against the same enemy, both crowns were to act in concert. When either was at war, offensively or defensively, it was to call upon the other for certain forces—Spain, upon France for 18,000 infantry, 6000 cavalry, 20 ships of the line, and 6 frigates; France

⁵² Flassan, *op. cit.*, VI. 160.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 279.

⁵⁴ Waddington, *op. cit.*, III. 427-442, and IV. 428-437, 555-572. See also *Recueil des Instructions*, XII.² (*Espagne*, pt. III.), p. 338.

upon Spain, for the same naval forces, 10,000 infantry, and 2000 cavalry. The Bourbon holdings in Italy were guaranteed absolutely. On the other hand, Spain was excused from assisting France in the guaranty of the peace of Westphalia unless a maritime power should take arms against the latter. Each power extended to the subjects of the other the commercial privileges of its own subjects in its European dominions.⁵⁵

The renewal of the Family Compact was Choiseul's greatest achievement and is to be regarded, moreover, as the starting point of the restoration of France's position in Europe. At the outset, however, it brought only fresh calamities and new losses. In October Pitt fell from power for urging a declaration of war upon Spain. None the less, the declaration followed in January. The English and provincial forces now turned from the capture of France's West Indian islands to that of Havana, which fell in July. But Choiseul, his eyes fixed on remoter developments, was determined that Spain should not suffer for her devotion to the Bourbon cause. On November 3, 1762, accordingly, France ceded to Spain New Orleans and all of Louisiana west of the Mississippi, an arrangement which permitted the latter to exchange the Floridas for Havana. The ensuing February 10 the peace of Paris was signed. By it France ceded to England the vast part territorially of what was still left of her colonies. Of the great empire that had once comprised half of North America and the richest of the American islands, and that had given fair promise to include eventually India and the West African coast, she retained Goree on the African coast; Santo Domingo, which, thanks to English diversion against Havana, her forces still held; Guiana, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Saint Lucia, and their dependencies; the small fishing islands St. Pierre and Miquelon, off Newfoundland; and a few factories in India, together with the islands of France and Bourbon, which she must not fortify, as also she must not the fishing stations.⁵⁶

Nevertheless, we must be on our guard against exaggerating the merely material aspect of the losses wrought France by the Seven Years' War. On the map, no doubt, Canada and Louisiana comprised an impressive domain, but regarded from the point of view of commerce and trade balances they were essentially worthless, Louisiana being practically uninhabited and Canada hardly returning the cost of administration. On the other hand, Guadeloupe and Martinique, in place of which England had finally and somewhat

⁵⁵ G. F. de Martens, *Recueil de Traités . . . des Puissances et États de l'Europe . . . depuis 1761 jusqu'à Présent* (Göttingen, 1817), I. 16-28.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 104-120; Lavissee and Rambaud, *op. cit.*, VII. 256-257.

reluctantly consented to take Canada, were commercially of great value.⁵⁷ France's real loss, apart from the enormous outlay of the war, was in prestige. Her armies had been defeated, her fleets annihilated, her allies disappointed and disgruntled. The treaty of peace itself signalized her humiliation most graphically by renewing the defunct provisions of the treaty of Utrecht against the fortification of Dunkirk, to which was later added provision for an English commissioner at that port, "without whose consent not a pier could be erected, not a stone turned". And not less ominous was the sort of demand that now began to be made by His Britannic Majesty's diplomatic representatives at various courts, that in view of the outcome of the war they were entitled to the precedence over His Most Christian Majesty's representatives. French pride could not have been more directly flouted.⁵⁸

How then was France to recover her prestige and the influence that this assured her upon Continental affairs? This was the question that addressed itself, and in terms ever more poignant, to the guardians of her diplomacy in the period between the treaty of Paris and the death of Louis XV. And the answers returned to this question by all schools of opinion on questions diplomatic carried with them the implication at least that before France could hope to regain her station in Europe, English power must be diminished. The story however is one that should be told in more detail, and in connection with it I desire to draw particular attention to two highly important documents: Choiseul's *Mémoire* of February, 1765, which comprises a general defense of his policy,⁵⁹ and Broglie's *Conjectures Raisonnées* of 1773, which voices the views at that date of an adherent of the more narrowly Continental point of view.⁶⁰

V.

Choiseul begins his exposition of the fundamentals of French diplomacy by tracing the calamities of the late war to one cause: the fact that the Austrian alliance was allowed to convert "the war on the sea and in America, which was the true war", to a purely

⁵⁷ On these points, see Flassan, *op. cit.*, VI. 480 ff.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, VI. 183-187; VII. 26-27.

⁵⁹ Soulange-Bodin, *La Diplomatie de Louis XV. et le Pacte de Famille* (Paris, 1894), pp. 236-253.

⁶⁰ "Conjectures Raisonnées sur la Situation actuelle de la France dans le Système Politique", etc., "Oeuvre dirigé par De Broglie et exécuté par M. Favier", dated April 16, 1773, and comprising the latter third of volume I. and all of volume II. of Ségur's *Politique de Tous les Cabinets* (third ed., Paris, 1801, 3 vols.). "C'est Favier critiqué par un disciple de Vergennes", Sorel, I. 308, foot-note. The "Conjectures" are also to be found in Boutaric's *Correspondance Secrète de Louis XV.* (Paris, 1866).

land war. Also it is admitted that the Austrian connection was always bound to be a precarious one. Nevertheless, it is insisted, it was of value as tending to conserve the peace on the Continent, for which reason it should be continued so long as it exacted no further material sacrifices by France. And the historical connections with the princes of the Empire should be viewed in the same light. The old policy of paying subsidies in advance should be discontinued. The English system was to pay for services rendered and this had proved much more effectual. But the one indispensable alliance of His Most Christian Majesty was with His Catholic Majesty. The foremost precept of His Majesty's policy henceforth must be, accordingly, "to manage with the most scrupulous attention his system of alliance with Spain, to regard the Spanish power as a power necessary to France". Nor would this be difficult, for the King of Spain was "just, firm, and one upon whom you can count even beyond the point at which France herself would fail you". The *Mémoire* concludes thus: "It remains for me to speak to Your Majesty of the maritime powers. England is the declared enemy of your power and of your state, and she will be so always." Many ages must elapse "before a durable peace can be established with this state, which looks forward to the supremacy in the four quarters of the globe. *Only the revolution which will occur some day in America, though we shall probably not see it, will put England back to that state of weakness in which Europe will have no more to fear of her.*"

Thus the *Mémoire* closed on something like a note of despair. Despair, however, was not Choiseul's normal attitude. Even a year before this, he had sent an agent named Pontleroy to British North America to report upon its resources and the strength of the lines connecting it with the mother-country,⁶¹ and now in 1766, with the news of the American outbreak against the Stamp Act at hand, the results of Pontleroy's investigation and their significance for France became the subject of active correspondence between Choiseul and His Most Christian Majesty's representatives at the court of St. James.

Judging from the small number of arrangements with reference to colonial possessions in America [Durand wrote Choiseul in August, 1767], Europe has only lately begun to sense their importance. England herself has discovered with surprise that they are the sources of the power which she enjoys and that these great objects of power and am-

⁶¹ C. De Witt, *Thomas Jefferson: Étude Historique sur la Démocratie Américaine* (third ed., Paris, 1861), p. 407. Most of the citations to this work are to the documents in the appendixes, pp. 393-559. See also F. Kapp, *Life of Kalb* (New York, 1870), pp. 43-44.

bition draw in their wake the balance of power in Europe. In brief, money has become so necessary to the sustenance of a government that without commerce no state has the wherewithal to uphold its dignity and independence; and commerce would dry up if it were not sustained by that branch of it which traffics in the products of America. It is there that England finds the outlet for her manufactures, and to what dimensions would these be reduced if they supplied only the markets of Europe at a time when every nation is endeavoring to make its own resources suffice and to prevent the departure of specie from its territory.⁶²

This, of course, is all in the best strain of the extremest mercantilism. Nevertheless, professing to fear the American colonies more than England herself, Durand advised against fomenting revolution among them, since to do so "might have the result of handing over the other colonies of Europe to those who by their excessive energy and strength had detached themselves from the parent stem".⁶³ Durand's successor, Châtelet, on the other hand, was strongly of the opinion that France ought to seize the first opportunity of intervening in America.

In the case of a rupture [he inquired of Choiseul early in December, 1767], even were it an open and premature one, between the colonies and Great Britain, could France and Spain remain idle spectators of an opportunity which in probability would never occur again? . . . Before six months have elapsed America will be on fire at every point. The question then is whether the colonists have the means of feeding it without the aid of a foreign war, and whether France and Spain should run the risk of taking an active part in fomenting the conflict and making it inextinguishable or whether it would be more their policy to leave it to itself at the risk of its going out for want of fuel and the means of spreading.⁶⁴

As a matter of fact, Choiseul had already taken a definite step toward interesting his government in the American situation. On April 22, 1767, he had despatched Kalb, who was later to distinguish himself as a major-general in Washington's army, to Amsterdam, there to inquire into "the rumors in circulation about the English colonies" and, should these be well founded, to "make preparations for a journey to America". In conformity with these and further instructions, Kalb finally sailed for America from Gravesend on October 4, arriving in Philadelphia January 2, 1768.⁶⁵ In essence, the deductions he arrived at from his inquiries into the

⁶² De Witt, pp. 420-421. See also to same effect pp. 427-428. Choiseul's viewpoint was precisely the same, *ibid.*, pp. 47-51.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 52. See also, to same effect, pp. 432-433.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 56-57, foot-note. Choiseul regarded these views as "profound", *ibid.* For further correspondence to the same effect, see *ibid.*, pp. 433-455.

⁶⁵ F. Kapp, *Life of Kalb*, pp. 45-51.

American situation were: that the moment had not yet arrived for France to embroil herself with her neighbors; that while the remoteness of the American population from their central government made them "free and enterprising", at bottom they were "but little inclined to shake off the English supremacy with the aid of foreign powers"; that "such an alliance would appear to them to be fraught with danger to their liberties"; that "a war with us would only hasten their reconciliation", so that "on the footing of restored privileges, the English court could even direct all the troops, resources and ships of this part of the world against our islands and the Spanish Main".⁶⁶

There can be little doubt that these observations, in the general assessment they made of American sentiment, squared with the facts, but that was small consolation to Choiseul, who in his disappointment petulantly charged Kalb with superficiality and pronounced his labors useless.⁶⁷ The result however was that now, abandoning any idea of actually interfering in America, the French minister began to formulate a plan whereby France and Spain should indirectly foster discontent in the English colonies by throwing open the ports of their own colonies to the products of North America.⁶⁸ This was on the basis of the theory that while the English colonies augmented the strength of England, those of France weakened her. "The thing to be aimed at", therefore, in the words of M. Abeille, Choiseul's secretary-general of commerce, was "to diminish the artificial strength of England and to relieve France of the burdens that obstruct the development of her native strength".⁶⁹ Indeed M. Abeille was for granting the French colonies their independence. But these views naturally encountered some opposition at Madrid; and in 1770 Choiseul fell from power.

VI.

Two years later occurred the first partition of Poland, all things considered, the most humiliating episode from the French point of view in the history of French diplomacy. Poland had been for centuries, with a fair degree of constancy, the ally and protégé of France. Since 1745 moreover Louis himself had been endeavoring, through the subterranean channels of the *Secret du Roi*, which indeed he had created for the purpose, to secure the succession of the House of Conti to the Polish throne.⁷⁰ The project of the

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 53-70 *passim*.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁶⁸ De Witt, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-63.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

⁷⁰ Lavissee and Rambaud, *op. cit.*, VII. 212-214.

royal brigands however was never known to His Most Christian Majesty's agents till it was *fait accompli*, and thus the most important transfer of territory since the peace of Westphalia, involving ultimately the extinction of the greatest state territorially in western Europe, was effected not only without the consent but without the knowledge of France. But worst of all, France's own ally Austria was *particeps criminis* to the act, even though a reluctant one at first. "She wept but she took", was the adequate account that Frederick gave of the empress's part in the transaction. Her course published to the world at large, in a way that tears more copious and more sincere than hers could not obliterate, that the desires of France no longer greatly counted in Europe.⁷¹

"The Tragedy of the North" it was that incited Broglie, the principal agent of the *Secret du Roi*, to the composition, in collaboration with the versatile Favier, of his elaborate *Conjectures Raisonnées*, referred to above.

"One would wish in vain", this document begins, "to conceal the rapid degradation of the credit of France in the courts of Europe, not only in consideration but even in dignity. From the primacy among great powers she has been forced to descend to a passive rôle or that of an inferior."⁷² Putting then the question as to the cause or causes of this unhappy transformation, Broglie first assailed "the change of system produced by the treaty of Versailles".⁷³ The preponderance in Europe was the rightful patrimony of the French crown: this was a dogma consecrated by a thousand years.⁷⁴ But the treaty of Versailles had accustomed Europe "to regard France as . . . subject to orders from Austria". To the same cause was it due that France had abandoned her ancient allies Sweden, Poland, Turkey, and the German princes; and worse still, that she had been made to fill the rôle of dupe in the recent developments in Poland and Turkey, the result of which was her own reduction to the fourth grade of powers.⁷⁵ The Family Compact of 1762, too, had had the worst possible effect upon European opinion, since by it Spain was admitted to virtual equality with France. "France for the first time admitted the equality of another power."⁷⁶

Thus far spoke the critic and rival of Choiseul. The longest section of the *Conjectures* however deals with England and the tone

⁷¹ Lavissee and Rambaud, VII. 503-511.

⁷² Ségur, *Politique de Tous les Cabinets*, I. 212.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 213, 258-264, 303-304; II. 33-34, 64, 88-92.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, I. 229-230.

here is significantly harmonious with that of Choiseul's *Mémoire*. The attitude of England toward France was that of ancient Rome toward Carthage. England of course did not expect to wipe out the French monarchy; her inferiority on land forbade the idea. But she had adopted the principle of keeping the French marine reduced, "of watching our ports, of surveying our dockyards and arsenals, of spoiling our projects, our preparations, our least movements". Her policy in this respect was to be explained in part by that spirit of rapine native to the English people, but also in part by the knowledge of the English ministers that the edifice of English power was still supported by factitious resources and forced means and that its natural tendency, in face of the approaching danger of a schism between the mother-country and her colonies, would be to crumble and dissolve. In short, it was *fear* that determined England's policy toward France, though a fear that knew how to choose its weapons. In view of this fact, France should know her real strength, should know that her industry, resources, patriotism, and intelligence were sufficient to overturn "the colossus of English power", could she once restore her marine. She should know too that the feeble line of conduct taken with England in the immediate past had but nourished English pride and disdain and that what was needed was a firm line of conduct. France's military system and her diplomatic policy alike must sustain the dignity and pre-eminence of the crown of France on sea as well as on land.⁷⁷

The influence of the *Conjectures Raisonnées* upon those who were interested in France's diplomatic position is beyond all question, and the same is true of Abbé Raynal's contemporaneous *Histoire des Indes*.⁷⁸ "The marine", declared this writer, "is a new kind of power which has given, in some sort, the universe to Europe. This part of the globe, which is so limited, has acquired, by means of its fleet, an unlimited empire over the rest so extended." Yet the benefit of this control had passed, in effect, to one nation alone, England, and with it had passed the balance of power. Such had not always been the case. In the days of Louis XIV. France had given the law to Europe, and the basis of her greatness had been her marine. Unfortunately, the excesses of this monarch, while cementing the alliance of the maritime states against France, had also turned the martial energies of the latter from the fleet to the army; and so French power had been doubly undermined.⁷⁹ The

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 165-197.

⁷⁸ Sorel, *op. cit.*, I. 304-310. "La doctrine de Favier se ramène à une proposition essentielle: l'anéantissement de l'Angleterre", *ibid.*, p. 306.

⁷⁹ *Histoire des Indes* (Paris edition, 1781), V. 203; VII. 208 ff.; IX. 88 ff., 219 ff.; and especially, X. 136 ff.

connection between England's greatness as a colonial power and her influence among the states of the world and the memory of France's greatness under Louis XIV. are constantly reiterated thoughts in Raynal's pages, and the course to which they incited French sentiment, both official and unofficial, is plain. "Favier", writes Sorel, "made disciples and Raynal proselytes."⁸⁰

Finally, we recur once more to the point of view of the real architect of French intervention in the American Revolution. Able, ambitious, conservative, of vast experience, yet not a little pedantic, Vergennes was thoroughly indoctrinated in the traditional objectives of French diplomacy and thoroughly trained in its traditional methods. Needless to say, he shared the resentment of all Frenchmen at the position of France in 1774.

Condescend, Sire, [he wrote the king in 1782] to consider the situation of France relative to the other powers of Europe when Your Majesty took the reins of government and did me the honor of putting me in charge of the Department of Foreign Affairs. The deplorable peace of 1763, the partition of Poland, and yet other causes equally unfortunate had impaired the consideration due Your Crown most deeply. France, but lately the object of the fear and jealousy of other powers, excited now quite the opposite sentiment: reputed the first power in Europe, one could scarcely assign her a place even among the second-rate.⁸¹

But these words are valuable not only as reminiscence but because they indicate Vergennes's appraisal of the results of the Revolution from the point of view of the French crown; for the inference is clear that the hour of humiliation was now regarded as having passed. Vergennes's theory of the rightful position of the French crown in Europe is stated in the *Mémoire* which he presented to Louis in April, 1778, on the approach of the emperor's visit to Paris, with a view to instructing the young king as to his proper demeanor on the occasion.

"France, placed in the centre of Europe", he wrote, "has the right to influence all great affairs. Her King, comparable to a supreme judge, is entitled to regard his throne as a tribunal set up by Providence in order to make respected the rights and properties of sovereigns."⁸²

⁸⁰ Sorel, *op. cit.*, I. 309.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 300. To like effect but couched in somewhat stronger terms is the minute on which the *Mémoire* of 1782 is based, Doniol, I. 2-3. See also Vergennes's *Mémoire* of March, 1784, Ségur, *La Politique de Tous les Cabinets*, III. 196 ff. "La France . . . n'a besoin ni d'agrandissement, ni de conquêtes. Toutes ses vues et toute son influence doivent donc être dirigées au maintien de l'ordre public et à prévenir que les différens pouvoirs qui composent l'équilibre de l'Europe, ne soient point détruits." *Ibid.*, pp. 200-201.

⁸² Flassan, *op. cit.*, VII. 140.

His more systematic expositions of his system at the outset of his taking office show Vergennes to have been something of an eclectic. From the *Système de Conservation* he inherited the idea that France had no need of further expansion but could well remain content with her existing resources of wealth and population. From Argenson he derived, by way of Broglie and Favier, the idea that France's Continental rôle was primarily that of defender of the smaller fry. From Choiseul he derived the belief that the Austrian alliance was to be cherished as making for Continental peace so long as it exacted no further sacrifices on the part of France and that the Family Compact with Spain was France's most valuable asset abroad. From all sources he took the conviction that the greatest menace to France's dignity and even security was English sea-power.⁸³ From the very beginning of his tenure Vergennes exerted an ever increasing influence over the king, who, ignorant and at bottom indifferent to France's internal condition, was well informed and intensely interested in diplomatic affairs, which, he judged, touched the honor of his house. Nor was this attitude without some justification in fact. Among a people so fond of glory as the French the very security of the Crown demanded that the dishonor which it had suffered abroad in the detested latter years of Louis XV. should be wiped away as speedily as possible.⁸⁴

France's intervention in the American Revolution is often described as an act of revenge. The description is less erroneous than incomplete, for while it calls to mind the fact that France had humiliations to be redressed, it fails to indicate the even more important fact that she had also a rôle to be retrieved. Furthermore it leaves entirely out of account the logic by which, in an Age of Reason, the purpose of either revenge or restoration was brought into relation with a concrete situation. The line of reasoning by which France was brought into the American Revolution comprised for the most part the following ideas: that France was en-

⁸³ The documents supporting these deductions are Vergennes's "Exposé succinct sur la Situation Politique de la France", etc., of 1774, Doniol, I. 14-21, and his elaborate "Instructions" to Baron de Breteuil of December 28 of the same year, *Recueil des Instructions*, I., *Autriche*, pp. 456-522. See also note 81.

⁸⁴ "Or la France, passionnée comme elle était pour la gloire, et qui aurait excusé bien des fautes du gouvernement intérieur, ne pardonna pas au Roi . . . son humiliation." Lavissee, *Histoire de France*, VIII.² 411. It is interesting to note that as early as November, 1775, Burke had predicted French intervention. "He observed, that from being the first, she was, with regard to effective military power, only the fifth state in Europe. That she was fallen below her former rank solely from the advantages we had obtained over her; and that if she could humble us, she would certainly recover her situation." *Parl. Hist.*, XVIII. 967.

titled by her wealth, power, and history, to the preponderating influence in Continental affairs; that she had lost this position of influence largely on account of Great Britain's intermeddling; that Great Britain had been enabled to mingle in Continental concerns by virtue of her great naval strength, her commercial prosperity, and her preparedness to maintain Continental subsidiaries; that these in turn were due in great part to her American colonial empire and especially to the policies controlling her trade therewith; that America, become independent, would be an almost total loss from the point of view of British interests; that this loss would mean a corresponding diminution of British power; that since the two were rivals, whatever abased the power of Great Britain would elevate the power of France. This, from the point of view of France's chief objective in intervening in the Revolution, from the point of view of the greatest advantage which she hoped to obtain from such a course, was the main chain of reasoning, but there were also supporting ideas that should not be lost to view. For one thing, it was by no means impossible that whether she intervened or not in behalf of the American rebels, France would find herself, sooner or later, at war with Great Britain in defense of the French West Indies. Again, it had for centuries been France's rôle to back the smaller fry against her greater rivals. Again, it was generally felt that, formidable as it was at the moment, British power was in reality more or less spurious. Yet again, recent diplomatic developments had most miraculously paved the way for French intervention in North America. The withdrawal of France from Canada had left America no reason to fear her; the Family Compact guaranteed the assistance of the Spanish marine; the Austrian alliance constituted a reasonable guaranty of peace on the Continent. Finally, it was felt to be not only allowable but right for France to seize so auspicious an opportunity to tear down a power that had been used so outrageously as England had used her power on the sea. In the end, the project did not lack some of the aspects of a crusade.

The primary requisite to a real understanding of Louis XVI.'s espousal of the cause of American independence is that due weight be given the fact that Europe was still organized on the dynastic principle, and to the further fact, especially noteworthy in the case of the elder branch of the House of Bourbon, that position and influence were the essential objectives of diplomacy, even in the age of "Benevolent Monarchy". To-day, with the voice of the common man dominant in the direction of society, historical investi-

gators are apt to give too slighting attention to all but bread-and-butter interests as interpretative of the conduct of states. But this is plain anachronism. The doctrine of the equality of men was indeed a tenet of the schools in 1776, but it had made little headway among the professional diplomatists, who still assessed the general welfare in terms furnished by the competition for station of rival reigning houses.

EDWARD S. CORWIN

THE EARLIER RELATIONS OF ENGLAND AND BELGIUM¹

I do not know whether the speeches of Charles Sumner are still read in the United States with the admiration which they inspired fifty years ago. In fact I do not know whether they are read at all. But from early boyhood I have recalled, at intervals, the purple patch with which Sumner closes his oration on *The True Grandeur of Nations*:

It is a beautiful picture in Grecian story, that there was at least one spot, the small island of Delos, dedicated to the gods, and kept at all times sacred from War. No hostile foot ever pressed this kindly soil, and citizens met here in common worship, beneath the aegis of inviolable Peace. So let us dedicate our beloved country. . . . The Temple of Honor shall be enclosed by the Temple of Concord; that it may never more be entered through any portal of War; the horn of Abundance shall overflow at its gates; the angel of Religion shall be the guide over its steps of flashing adamant; while within . . . Justice, returned to the earth from long exile in the skies . . . shall rear her serene and majestic front.

It is now rather more than two generations since the great powers of Europe tried the experiment of converting the old Austrian Netherlands into a modern Delos. To transform this cockpit into the neutralized Belgium was an ambitious effort, involving the recognition of public law as a real force in modern life. Apparently mankind is less virtuous than it was assumed to be, or else new doctrines regarding the nature of the state have consigned to the scrap-heap ideas which were deemed fundamental in 1831. At any rate we have been witnesses of a grim fiasco. The Belgian Delos has been destroyed, and it follows that the Swiss Delos exists on sufferance. Henceforth the Happy Island of the Aegean must be classed with the Happy Valley of Abyssinia among the figments of the imagination. In fact Delos would be forgotten were it not for the American Historical Association. Here its memory, its ideal survives, and far be it from me to disturb this haven of peace by introducing matters of controversy. The present subject would not have occurred to me but for the fact that I was asked to treat of English history in recent times. Then came events which brought Belgium into the centre of the stage. Hence it seemed that a few remarks

¹A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, December 30, 1914.

upon the past contact of England with Belgium might not be without interest.

Those who revel in origins and study the past *ab ovo* will doubtless remember that the Netherlands (or at least the northern part thereof) were rescued from paganism by the English—that is to say by Wilfrid and Willibrord of Northumbria; and by St. Boniface, the West Saxon, who also converted the Germans. Willibrord likewise had a double sphere of activity, inasmuch as he converted the heathen of Heligoland. But these events happened long ago, and have little more bearing upon Belgium than the Bull of Alexander VI. has on the Monroe Doctrine. The same may be said regarding the export of English wool to Bruges in the fourteenth century; Chaucer's statement that the Wife of Bath was more accomplished at the loom than the weavers of Ypres and Ghent; the marriage of Edward III. to Philippa of Hainault; the profanity of the troops in Flanders; and *Malbrouck s'en va-t-en guerre*.

We come, however, to something like modern relations between England and Belgium, in the period of the younger Pitt. This pacific son of a warlike sire was eventually dragged from his orbit by the strifes of the French Revolution, but his troubles had begun several years before the Jacobins decided to behead their king. With Oczakov, Nootka Sound, and the revolt of Belgium all going on at the same time, Pitt was fully occupied in 1789 and 1790.

Nootka Sound we may at once eliminate, but Oczakov and Belgium became very completely entangled with each other and with all the complications of European state-craft at this time. It was just as well that the British Foreign Office, under the Duke of Leeds, should have had something to stir it up. Sir Robert Keith, the ambassador at Vienna, stated that he had sent home fifty-two consecutive despatches without receiving a single reply, and that on the average he received one reply to forty despatches. But in the summer of 1789 Pitt evidently took over the writing of despatches himself, for their quality at once leaps to a high level and business receives attention.

Looking back at the tangled skein of European diplomacy as it was on the eve of the French Revolution, there are certain things which catch the eye instantly. The first of these is the league of England and Prussia—with whom, in the Triple Alliance of 1788, Holland also is grouped. England had issued from the War of the American Revolution without credit, cash, or friends. Her dream of imperialism seemed shattered, and for a time the task was that of picking up the pieces—a task in which much useful assistance was rendered by the Industrial Revolution. However, after the

lapse of a few years, the Continent began to realize that England had not disappeared from the map altogether. Indeed, this fact was grasped quite quickly by Prussia when, in 1787, Catherine II. and Joseph II. went off on their picturesque, though not romantic, excursion to the Crimea.

The Belgian uprising of 1789-1790 occurred in the midst of the war which Catherine and Joseph were conducting against the Porte—with more advantage to Russia than to Austria. It may be worthy of mention that the immediate trouble between the Belgians and their Austrian rulers was caused by disputes regarding the University of Louvain—which would appear to be a storm centre. What at first was a zephyr, soon became a hurricane. Before the close of 1789 the rule of the Hapsburgs at Brussels seemed to be overthrown. Early in January, 1790, a federal republic was declared—the United States of Belgium. Then Joseph died, Leopold came in, and Belgian freedom was put down by Austria after an existence of rather less than twelve months. But the incident lasted long enough to leave a striking record in the archives of the British Foreign Office. Above all, English despatches to Berlin show how seriously the issue was considered by Pitt, and how large an element Belgium grew to be in the relations of England and Prussia.

The desire of Frederick William II. to injure Austria by encouraging revolt in Belgium was closely bound up with his desire to enlarge his own kingdom in another quarter. Prussia still lacked Thorn and Danzig. If through the help of Frederick William, Poland could regain Galicia, she might be willing to let Prussia have Thorn and Danzig. With this enterprise the Belgian question became involved, since the success of the Polish project depended largely on the degree of England's friendship, which, in turn, was conditioned appreciably by the unfolding of the situation in Belgium.

As the face of the world was so soon afterwards transformed by the French Revolution, we need not pause to conjecture how Belgian affairs would have developed but for the collapse of the Old Régime. It is enough to note that on the very eve of the deluge Belgium was a danger spot which gave England grave concern, helping her to crystallize very definite views regarding the future of this region to which fate has denied the boon of natural frontiers. Charles Emmanuel of Savoy said that he was prevented by geography from being an honest man, but to no state has geography been so cruel as to Belgium. Pitt recognized with perfect clearness all the physiological elements in the case, as affecting England, and acted accordingly. When the United States of Belgium cut loose from Austria they had no trouble in getting countenance from Prussia.

England and Holland, however, were by no means ready to recognize and support the Belgian republic. On the one hand, Pitt wished to keep friends with Prussia; on the other, he strongly objected to the creation of a Belgium so weak as to invite inroads which might embarrass and endanger England. While he and the Prussian Foreign Office exchanged despatches, the Austrians settled the matter by upsetting the new Belgian commonwealth.

Thus a Belgian crisis arose at the moment when the National Assembly of France was beginning to shape its famous constitution. The outstanding features of the incident are these. England and Prussia as allies face Austria and Russia in a balance-of-power rivalry which discovers clashing interests from the Black Sea to Ostend. Pitt wants Belgium to be in safe hands—that is, in the hands of those who will not use their sea-coast as a menace to England. His whole action shows that he is much more interested in compassing this end than in helping Prussia to gain Thorn and Danzig. Finally, the Belgium of 1790 was mixed up with Oczakov, as the Belgium of July, 1914, was mixed up with the ultimatum to Serbia. Lowell said that the devil always has his finger in the Irish pie. The Eastern Question, with a more complete ubiquity, seems subject to the same malevolence.

But, after all, Pitt's connection with Belgium is a matter of academic interest when measured by the part which Palmerston took in the Belgian Revolution of 1830. To give its due perspective to this phase of England's relations with Belgium would be to trace the rise and persistence of the Canning tradition in Downing Street. Omitting the perspective, let us come to that very pretty interplay of English Whigs with July Monarchists, of the downright Palmerston with the astute, experienced Talleyrand. Even after the Belgians had driven out the Dutch, Belgium lay at the mercy of the Five Powers. As Nothomb, the Belgian patriot, himself said: "We are only four millions. We cannot expect to give the law to the rest of Europe." In these circumstances the problems of Belgian independence and neutrality were solved by the powers, notably by France and England.

Raymond Guyot has written an excellent account of Talleyrand's part in the negotiations which led up to the creation of Belgium as a separate kingdom. Approaching the same subject from the English side, special attention must be called to Palmerston's despatches and private correspondence. His letters to Lord Granville, then British ambassador at Paris, are particularly graphic—though Palmerston never excelled his great exemplar, Canning, in mere raciness.

The Belgian Question which confronted Talleyrand and Pal-

merston might just as well, in degree of complexity, have been the Macedonian Question. The Congress of Vienna gave Belgium to Holland, not because it loved the Dutch or the House of Orange, but because the Allies of Chaumont were resolved that the cockpit should not belong to France. On this point no one at Vienna had been more convinced than Castlereagh. After Castlereagh's death, Canning developed sympathy for oppressed nationalities, and in 1830 the Belgians seemed to come under this rule. Moreover if oppressed nationalities had appealed to a Tory like Canning, *a fortiori* they deserved to appeal to a Whig administration like that of Lord Grey.

Thus England in shaping her Belgian policy at the moment when Wellington gave place to Grey, was compelled, first of all, to clarify her own thought on the subject. Self-protection had led her at Vienna to see that Antwerp, Zeebrugge, and Ostend should not be used against herself. In 1830 there was a distinct risk that if Belgium cut loose from Holland she would not be strong enough to resist powerful neighbors who coveted her soil and her ports. On the other hand, Belgium's plea for independence appeared reasonable, and was manifestly supported by the desire of four million people. Lord Grey himself would have been glad to settle the matter on the basis of Belgian autonomy, with a cadet of the House of Orange for sovereign. And in the first stage of the Revolution the Belgians might have listened to a compromise of this sort. But the affair advanced rapidly and King William of Holland was so unpopular at Brussels that the whole House of Orange soon fell under condemnation. The first problem for England was whether to join Russia and Austria in enforcing the arrangements made at Vienna, or frankly to acknowledge Belgian independence.

Presented as a sharp choice of alternatives there was but one course for the Whigs to take. They were the party of freedom, whose recent advent to power after immemorial years in opposition placed them under the necessity of supporting their principles. Their own Reform Bill, then being drafted, was a measure of emancipation. They approved of the July Revolution in Paris and had been helped by it. France and England had never been so close in sympathy, and through their co-operation Belgium was established as a sovereign, neutral state.

But even with the help of a good understanding between the July Monarchists and the Whigs, the path was thorny. It would have been thornier still but for the revolution in Poland, which kept Nicholas occupied at home during the critical months of the Belgian crisis, and for the risings in Italy which made the winter of 1831 a

busy time for Metternich. Thus favored by fortune Talleyrand and Palmerston managed to work Belgium out of her worst troubles before the close of 1831. Their difficulties were caused less by interference from the three autocrats than by the restlessness of the war party at Paris.

Talleyrand, the most sagacious adviser of Louis Philippe, desired above all things that the Citizen King should keep the peace, and this was also the wish of Louis Philippe himself. But Laffitte and General Sebastiani had also to be reckoned with, and Palmerston was deeply concerned lest they should do things which he not only could not support but must openly oppose. The fact, of course, was that at home the July Monarchy rested on a very insecure foundation and the chauvinist faction among its supporters was anxious that foreign affairs should yield a little *réclame* which could be used in the elections. Charles X., during the last days of the Bourbon monarchy, had worked out a promising foreign policy in alliance with Russia. But the July Revolution turned Nicholas from a friend into an enemy. Laffitte and his supporters were hungry for a little glory—if not real glory, at least electoral glory—and it was hoped by them that Palmerston would be good-natured enough to assist their little game with the French voters. They did not ask for the dismemberment of Belgium. A slight rectification of the southern frontier would answer quite well.

To blandishments of this kind Palmerston turned a deaf ear. Not an inch of Belgian soil should be taken by anyone, on any pretext, except over England's dead body. Once suffer the wedge to enter, even by a razor's breadth, and then all the neighbors, including Prussia, would clamor for their share. This issue, once raised, meant a general war, for Louis Philippe had said to Pozzo di Borgo that under no circumstances must Prussia enter Belgium, "for we will not permit it".

The Conference of London was the agency employed to settle Belgian affairs without war. It had been proposed by Wellington that the powers should exchange views on Belgium as well as on Greece; but in November, 1830, the Tories were driven from office, and it became Palmerston's task to carry on the pacification which the duke had begun. Towards both Holland and Belgium the Conference of London was very firm. Its first act was to declare that there must be an armistice between these belligerents while the powers were settling their affairs for them: and an armistice was accordingly declared.

Little trouble arose over Belgian autonomy. Even Russia was willing to concede this, if a federal connection with Holland were

maintained and a Prince of Orange made king over Belgium and Luxembourg. But the Belgians would listen to no proposals which made them ancillary to the Dutch, and on November 24 their first legislature excluded the House of Orange from the throne. Under ordinary circumstances Nicholas might not have taken this quietly. The Polish revolution tied his hands. Talleyrand then hurried business on so fast that by December 18 the Conference of London decided Belgium should be a separate kingdom, after which it only remained to select the king and agree on the frontiers. Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg was Palmerston's choice for king,² and to this Talleyrand agreed; though Sebastiani, then French minister of foreign affairs, was carrying on an intrigue behind Talleyrand's back in favor of the Duc de Nemours.

The selection of a sovereign and the apportionment of the debt were both important, but the territorial aspects to the case constituted the greatest menace to a peaceful solution. It was in January, 1831, that Talleyrand began vigorously to advocate the principle of neutralization. No one knew better than he that France would be unable to secure any part of Belgium for herself, and

² It is not necessary to recite the intricate story of the negotiations which preceded the nomination of Belgium's first king. Wellington, Aberdeen, and Grey would all have preferred to see a prince of the House of Orange on the Belgian throne, and Leopold was only taken as a result of elimination. Against him were his rather equivocal record with regard to the candidature for the Greek throne, and, in certain quarters, his English affiliations. When, during the spring of 1831, it became a question between Leopold and the Duc de Nemours, Palmerston took the ground that the Duc de Nemours was not to be thought of, whereas Leopold would prove a loyal king of the Belgians, not subservient to England or any other power. The most striking passage which bears on this subject will be found in a letter of Palmerston to Granville, dated April 1, 1831.

"Talleyrand read me two days ago a despatch from Sebastiani, saying that France would support Leopold; and that he had no doubt that England, for the sake of an arrangement so advantageous to her, would agree to all the French wishes about Bouillon and Luxembourg and Maestricht, etc. Talleyrand, before I could say anything, said that the answer he meant to give was, that the election of Leopold was an object of comparative indifference to us, and that we were not disposed to make any sacrifices to obtain it.

"I said he was quite right, and begged him also to say that, even if we looked upon Leopold's election as a matter of English interest, still we were bound by engagements to other Powers, and that we should preserve our good faith in preference to consulting our selfish interests; that consequently the election of Leopold would make no change whatever in our opinions and determinations, and that we should not be a whit more inclined to support the unreasonable pretensions of the Belgians with Leopold than without him. But I said the reason we wished for Leopold, next after a member of the family of Orange, was that we think he would become a good *Belgian king*; that he would be no more English than French, but would look to his own interests, and to those of the State which he governed." Bulwer, *Life of Palmerston*, II, 61-62.

neutralization would at least prevent an enemy from getting too close to Lille and Maubeuge. Here again Talleyrand was opposed to Sebastiani, but he had his way and the protocol of January 28, 1831, accepts the principle of Belgian neutrality, coupling therewith a noble statement as to the complete and perpetual disinterestedness of the powers.

So far Palmerston and Talleyrand worked harmoniously, and, indeed, throughout the transaction, Palmerston's chief anxieties were caused by Sebastiani rather than by Talleyrand. In August, 1831, a French army, invited by King Leopold, crossed the frontier and gave aid to the Belgians in resisting an invasion by the Dutch. Ample assurance had been given by Talleyrand that the French troops would withdraw on the completion of their task. None the less, Palmerston was clearly nervous, and on August 11 he wrote Granville a very strong letter to describe the excitement of Parliament on hearing the news of this expedition. The closing words ran as follows:

The French Government are perpetually telling us that certain things must, or must not, be done, in order to satisfy public opinion in France; but they must remember that there is a public feeling in England as well as in France; and that although that feeling is not as excitable upon small matters as the public mind in France, yet there are points (and Belgium is one) upon which it is keenly sensitive, and upon which, if once aroused, it would not easily be appeased.³

As the French withdrew in due course, nothing happened; but the incident is eloquent. Palmerston's despatch shows that however friendly the Whigs were with the Orleanists, they were not disposed to leave Belgian affairs at loose ends. Talleyrand, at Sebastiani's instance, wheedled skillfully for Philippeville and Marienbourg, but he did not get them.

Palmerston said that Belgium was one of the points upon which English public opinion was keenly sensitive, and upon which, if once aroused, it would not easily be appeased. This is a statement which requires some comment, both in the light of conditions which existed in 1831, and in the light of those which have come to exist since then. It obviously is impossible to cite the evidence here, but my own opinion is that England was more sensitive about Belgium in 1870 than in 1831, and that the same feeling has gathered strength ever since 1870.

At the outset England was drawn towards the Netherlands by considerations which affected her own safety. This is clear from the policy which Pitt pursued in 1790. To justify his solicitude,

³ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

France soon seized Belgium and conquered Holland, with the result that for twenty years English statesmen did not enjoy their normal amount of sleep. With this recent experience it is not strange that in 1814 the instinct of self-protection should have determined the attitude of England towards Belgium. The same attitude of mind existed in 1831, and it is to this that Palmerston alludes in the words which have been quoted.

But when the new Kingdom of Belgium began its career under Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, the feeling of England towards her small neighbor across the Channel ceased to be determined by self-interest alone. For one thing, she felt that the existence of Belgium was largely due to her. Though all the Five Powers joined in the final guaranty of neutrality, the actual work of construction had been done by France and England. As between these two states England had prevailed when Sebastiani insisted that France should at least receive some portion of Belgian soil. Thus England had favored Belgian independence and Belgian neutrality, had supported Leopold against the Duc de Nemours, had prevented France from snapping up any of the border fortresses. England, in short, was ready from the outset to feel a maternal interest in the fortunes of that Belgium with the creation of which she had been so intimately connected.

This sentiment was strengthened by the excellent account which the Belgians gave of themselves. Their independence had been conceded under the condition of perpetual neutrality. Not only did they fulfill their part of the bargain by abstaining from plots of ambition, they held up to Europe an example of the quiet, industrious community which seeks nothing better than to do its work in peace. Naturally England watched this unfolding of events with great satisfaction. Thirty-two years after the Belgian Revolution the *Quarterly Review* is finding that the people of the two countries are linked by an identity of taste and temper. "An ardent love of liberty", it says, "a taste for natural scenery, an enthusiastic attachment to agriculture, an appreciation of domestic comfort and love of country life characterize alike the people of Belgium and England."

It is true that for some years the English did not like the Belgian tariff, which discriminated against them to the advantage of the French, but presently this grievance disappeared. When England went in for free trade the imports from Belgium increased enormously. In 1846 they were 9,000,000 francs; in 1862 they had reached 100,000,000. More important, though, than the commercial tie was the feeling that the Belgian experiment had proved a

success. In 1830 Belgian aspirations were a nuisance because they disturbed the settled order and introduced dangerous complications. Forty years later Belgium had so far justified her existence that to most Englishmen the conquest of her territory by foreign force would have seemed a worse crime than the partition of Poland—worse because Belgium was much more orderly and well behaved than Poland had ever been.

Burke was unwilling to indict a whole people, and it is equally illegitimate to ascribe to a whole people the nobler ideals which are as a lamp to the elect. With this express limitation it may be said that English sentiment regarding Belgian neutrality has become less selfish with the growth of the conviction that great powers should recognize those express covenants which guarantee the existence of small, unambitious states. The corollary of this conviction is the belief that a breach of public law may become a *casus belli*. Cobden believed so completely in moral force that he advised the Belgians to do away with their army altogether. During the crisis of the Franco-Prussian War, Parliament was deeply stirred by the publication of the arrangement discussed by Bismarck and Benedetti under which France was to take Belgium with the connivance of Prussia. Gladstone thought it would be quixotic for England to oppose France and Germany if they united to dismember Belgium, but, lover of peace though he was, decided that England should join with either to prevent the other from breaking its covenant. His special treaty of 1870 was designed to enforce in a specific instance the principles of the 1831 protocol, as finally embodied in the treaty of 1839. Gladstone, Disraeli, and the *Times* were at one in recognizing that while England had every reason for standing outside the war if Belgium were unmolested, she must use every effort to secure the validity of the mutual guaranty.

Here the two most significant utterances are those of Gladstone in his correspondence with Bright. On August 1, 1870, he writes: "We do not think it would be right, even if it were safe, to announce that we would in any case stand by with folded arms, and see actions done which would amount to a total extinction of public right in Europe." On August 4, after stating the view of the Cabinet, he continues:

I add for myself this confession of faith. If the Belgian people desire, on their own account, to join France or any other country, I for one will be no party to taking up arms to prevent it. But that the Belgians, whether they would or not, should go "plump" down the maw of another country to satisfy dynastic greed, is another matter. The accomplishment of such a crime as this implies, would come near to an extinction

of public right in Europe, and I do not think we could look on while the sacrifice of freedom and independence was in course of consummation.⁴

There are moralists who seem to maintain that where one's interest is served by the discharge of one's duty, it is discreditable—and, indeed, hypocritical—to discharge the duty. Not being an expert in ethics I am unable to say. But I do believe that on the fourth day of August last many people in England considered the Belgian question first from the standpoint of duty, and were willing that their country should discharge important obligations because it was the *right* thing to do.

CHARLES W. COLBY

⁴ Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, II. 342.

A THEORY OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

IN biography the scientific element, the colorless objectivity of pure investigation, is not the most potent. Personality is too elusive to arise from the dead through a mere array of facts. Let us be frank with ourselves and admit that as biographers we are always theorists, always working out of the facts we have observed some containing theory that shall cause them to cohere, to accept an inner illumination from a central source, to strike our sensibilities, to evoke a person. All attempts at biography, however modest, are attempts at art. They can never fully escape impressionism. The present brief study is no more than an impression of what it is that appears to one observer to be shining through from the back of the facts of Davis's life and revealing their unity.

The basis of this impression is his youth and in that youth the central fact is this: he was a boy without a country. Consider the calendar of his wanderings: born in Kentucky, 1808; taken to Mississippi while a little child; sent back to Kentucky at the age of seven; back to Mississippi at nine; to Kentucky again, to enter Transylvania University, when he was but fourteen; removed from Transylvania direct to West Point; thence after a short visit to Mississippi removed to the far Northwest, where he saw nine years of military service among the Indians.¹ From fourteen to twenty-seven his associations were all outside the state in which his family was settled. Nor did he have an opportunity to acquire the sense that he *belonged* in any of the communities where temporarily he resided. He was a bird of passage. In reflecting upon the basis of his nature, the part that was laid before maturity, we should always remember that it was not the product of a single soil. His was a migratory growth, frequently transplanted.

Furthermore, there was not in the history of his family that traditional attachment to some abandoned locality, or that memory of a lost social status, either of which has at times, in the imagination of a youth of genius, proved the ruling power. The same roving note which was the tonic of his own early life had long been the tonic of his family history. His grandfather, Evan Davis, a

¹ *Jefferson Davis: a Memoir*, by his wife, I. 1-160, contains the classic story of his youth. Professor Dodd's recent biography is, of course, the standard modern work.

Welsh immigrant, passed from Pennsylvania to Georgia; his father, Samuel Davis, a soldier of the Revolution, fought in the service of South Carolina and there still exists a land patent issued after the war by the state of South Carolina to Samuel Davis. In the East the family never rose above the middle rank in life—if, indeed, they quite reached it.² And this, it may be, partly explains why Samuel Davis about 1800 migrated to Kentucky; why he roved on to Mississippi, where—chiefly, it would seem, through the abilities of his eldest son, Joseph Emory Davis—the family at last emerged into prominence. A roving past, the absence in Jefferson Davis of any strong flavor of the soil, and about him ever the atmosphere of the new man risen from the ranks: these are basal facts generally ignored.

Of his childhood and early youth little has been preserved or, at least, revealed. But even thus we make out at the opening some of the salient features of his character. Sensibility of a romantic sort informs that charming episode narrated by Mrs. Davis³ of the priests who taught little Jefferson, when the lad was at school, at Bardstown, for whom he formed so great an attachment that he wished for a time to become a member of the Church of Rome. His intrepid courage appears in the anecdote of his composure during an accident in a magazine of explosives at West Point while a class was being instructed in the making of fire balls. A ball became ignited. While every one else, including the professor, ran for his life, young Davis took the ball in his hands and threw it out of a window.⁴ The affair of his first marriage, with its valiant pursuit of affection even at great sacrifice, falls in with these other details of a bold and romantic nature. He had fallen in love with the daughter of his commanding officer, Colonel Zachary Taylor, who opposed the match. Young Davis found himself assigned to a remote post, Fort Gibson, on the edge of the Indian country,⁵ far, far, from the vicinity of his beloved. The fiery young officer endured

² Mrs. Davis, in her *Memoir*, I. 3-7, touches lightly on the matter of origin. Between the lines we read a plain record of frontier conditions.

³ *Memoir*, I. 13-15. See also W. L. Fleming, "The Religious Life of Jefferson Davis", *Methodist Review*, April, 1910.

⁴ *Memoir*, I. 53. See also Fleming, "Jefferson at West Point", *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, X. 247-267.

⁵ The inference that Taylor caused his removal for personal reasons is too plausible to be combatted without more definite proof to the contrary than has yet been produced. See Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, p. 41. The entire episode is in the *Memoir*, I. 93-162, but with no mention of the cause of his assignment to Fort Gibson. For much interesting detail, including his effort to fight a duel with his prospective father-in-law, see Fleming, "Jefferson Davis' First Marriage", *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, XII. 21-36.

his exile more than a year, then threw up his commission, went to Lexington where Miss Taylor was visiting a sympathetic aunt and with the good lady's connivance carried off the maiden in triumph. The personal recollections of him in this early time are all in the same key, allowing for the difference in age, as that best description of him we have, the one given by Carl Schurz of the Davis of his happiest time, when he was secretary of war:

I had in my imagination formed a high idea of what a grand personage the War Minister of this great Republic must be. I was not disappointed. He received me graciously. His slender, tall, erect figure, his spare face, keen eyes, and fine forehead, not broad, but high and well-shaped, presented the well-known strong American type. There was in his bearing a dignity that seemed entirely natural and unaffected—that kind of dignity which does not invite familiar approach, but will not render one uneasy by lofty assumption. His courtesy was without any condescending air. . . . His conversation ran in . . . easy . . . well-chosen and sometimes even elegant phrase, and the timbre of his voice had something peculiarly agreeable. . . . I heard him deliver a speech in the Senate and again I was struck by the dignity of his bearing, the grace of his diction, and the rare charm of his voice—things which greatly distinguished him from many of his colleagues.⁶

One cannot escape the idea that in its effect upon Davis's brilliant and impressionable youth the army must to a considerable extent have been his country. Of what part of earth, in those early days, could he have felt that it was truly his own? Not Kentucky, surely, in spite of his birthplace, since so few of his years were passed there; still less Mississippi, which he had known but as a small child and again, for a few years, while preparing for college, a third time as a cadet on vacation, and where as yet his family was without associations. Only in the army, in its perfect system, its pageantry, its large designs, its powerful effects, could the youth have found that basis for the kindling imagination, which, in the usual case of the gifted youth, is supplied by a vivid sense of his immediate community. And in this connection it is well to anticipate the rivalries of his later years. Long afterward, in his final crisis, Davis failed to appreciate a certain type of man. It was a type in which love of one's community had become a passion. To that type he appeared, in those stern days, a monster. To him, apparently, the crushing of that type seemed a matter of course. Have we not here the solution of one at least of the many problems

⁶ *Reminiscences*, II. 21. Mrs. Davis speaks of his "beautiful blue eyes". *Memoir*, I. 51. Her account of his character has a flavor of Sir Galahad. She quotes George W. Jones, his classmate at Transylvania, to the effect that he was "always gay and of buoyant spirits but without the slightest tendency toward vice or immorality . . . never . . . under the influence of liquor and never gambled". *Memoir*, I. 28.

of his career? Was there not at the bottom of his mind, so far as the sense of community was concerned, a neutral ground? Surely this youth, determined so largely by an association, the army, lacked the special sort of mental color which is furnished only by early responsiveness to a distinctive environment, and had in place of it a sense of efficiency, of the sacrifice of the means to the end—*esprit du corps* in distinction from patriotism—overwhelmingly military.

At twenty-seven this confident young officer, who was practically a stranger in Mississippi, began his belated attachment to a community. The next eight years form, to the psychological observer, the most interesting chapter in his life. They were years of intense inward experience amid outward calm. The death of his wife; a collapse in health and spirits and an eventual recovery; the acquisition of wealth or its beginning; his preparation for politics: such is the obvious part of the record of these eight years. But that was not all. He underwent a transformation. The question how complete it was—whether it made any approach to being complete—is the central problem that challenges his biographers. Between the age of twenty-seven and the age of thirty-five, he changed outwardly from a stranger, a military man whose country was the army, to a prosperous Southern planter, a local Mississippi politician. But, again, how real was the change? Had the member of the army, the man whose basal idea was faithfulness to a chance association of comrades, become in truth the citizen of a state, the man whose course henceforth should base itself on that far more abstract idea, the idea of a predestined continuity in the life of the commonwealth? It is futile to attempt to answer this question without estimating the effect upon him, during these eight years of readjustment, of the community in which he received politically his determining bent.

In 1835 the state of Mississippi was eighteen years old. Even as a territory its history went back only thirty-seven years. As late as 1800 it was still a wilderness that Spain had but recently renounced to the United States. In 1835 there was not one man of middle life who had been born either in the state or the territory of Mississippi. The census of 1800 had given the territory less than 5000 inhabitants; the census of 1830 gave the state 136,000; that of 1840, 375,651.⁷

Necessarily the new state had a cosmopolitan flavor. How inevitably this was the case one significant fact will show. If one were to name half a dozen Mississippians who were the chief figures of their state previous to 1850, common consent would cer-

⁷ *Abstract of Twelfth Census*, tables 35 and 36.

tainly name Jacob Thompson, John A. Quitman, Henry S. Foote, Robert J. Walker, Sargent S. Prentiss, and Jefferson Davis. The clew to the early history of Mississippi is revealed by the recital of their birthplaces. Thompson was born in North Carolina; Quitman in New York; Foote in Virginia; Walker in Pennsylvania; Prentiss in Maine; Davis in Kentucky. A patriotic Mississippian might have paraphrased the boast of that remote New Englander centuries before and declare that God had "sifted a whole Nation" to make possible the western world.

The virtues of such a community are optimism and flexibility. The variety of their inherited points of view imposes upon its citizens a spirit of give-and-take as the necessary basis of society; and by making all their traditions equally respectable prevents any one from becoming dominant. A free, even careless, attitude toward the past is a natural result. Out of this grows a fine opportunism with regard to the chief bequest of the past, the process of government. Ends rather than means are the great concern of such a community. And the temper in which their ends are conceived is sure to be large, audacious, hopeful, imaginative. In the lordliness of their self-confidence their hearts are already at the end of the rainbow. They have perfect faith that somehow they will cross that bridge, when the time comes—just how they do not care.

However, in the vision of the future that possessed Mississippi in 1835 there were certain definite lines. The list of birthplaces of the six chief ones might, in one respect, induce a false impression. Though those six were half of them Northern, half Southern, in origin, that division did not apply to the population generally. It was overwhelmingly Southern.⁸ From Georgia, round a great

⁸ The statistics of the increase of slaves tell the tale, thus: 1800-1810, 384.9 per cent.; 1810-1820, 125.9; 1820-1830, 100.1; 1830-1840, 197.3; 1840-1850, 58.7. *Century of Population Growth*, p. 134. The statistics of the total increase of population are closely similar; for the corresponding decades the percentages are: 356.0; 87.0; 81.0; 175.0; 61.5; 30.5. The corresponding statistics for the Northwest show that the two sections were receiving settlers in about the proportion that might be expected. In the crucial decade, 1830-1840, population increased according to the following percentages: Ohio, 62.0; Indiana, 99.9; Illinois, 202.4; Michigan, 570.9. *Abstract of Twelfth Census*, p. 36.

Another determining bit of evidence is the comment of the High Court of Errors and Appeals on the act of the Mississippi legislature, passed in 1833, prohibiting the introduction of slaves from the border states: "There was fear that if the border States were permitted to sell us their slaves, and thus localize the institution, they, too, would unite in the wild fanaticism of the day and render the institution of slavery, thus reduced to a few Southern States, an easy prey to its wicked spirit." *Mitchell v. Wells*, *Mississippi Reports*, VII. 89, quoted in *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, IV. 89.

In connection with this interesting revelation of a legislative purpose, there

crescent, embracing all the seaboard, Kentucky, and Tennessee, Southern streams of migration had converged upon Mississippi. Consequently the new community was a composite picture of the whole South; and like all composite pictures it emphasized only the common factors of all its components. What all the South had in common, what made a man a Southerner in the general sense—in distinction from a Northerner, on the one hand, or a Virginian, Carolinian, Georgian, on the other—could have been observed in Mississippi, in 1835 and 1840, as nowhere else. Consequently, an image of Southern life in general terms was the vision of things hoped for by the ardent new men of the Southwest. The elements of that vision were common to them all—country life, the broad acres, generous hospitality, an aristocratic system.⁹ Their tempera-

is another contemporaneous statement that seems to me, in the light of the former, to strike the true Mississippi note. In 1834 the Democratic state convention resolved unanimously "that a constitutional right of Secession from the Union on the part of a single state, as asserted by the nullifying leaders of South Carolina, is utterly unsanctioned by the Constitution which was framed to establish not destroy the Union". It was also resolved to sustain the President in the full exercise of his powers to "restore peace and harmony to our distracted country and to maintain unsullied and unimpaired the honor, the independence and the integrity of our Union". See speech of J. A. Wilcox, March 9, 1852, *Congressional Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 sess., app., p. 284. Is not this union of the Southern social ideal with a phase of nationalism a keynote that has not been sufficiently considered? And may there not be something symptomatic in the fact that three of the six Mississippi leaders—Foote, Walker, and Davis—closed their careers ambiguously, distrusted, to say the least, by the genuine states' right men. The end of Walker is of course known to everyone. But a work as near to standard as Appleton's *Cyclopaedia of American Biography* does not mention the fact that Foote was at last expelled from the Confederate Congress, following his arrest by the military authorities while attempting to pass through the lines on some sort of private negotiation with Washington. *Journals of the Confederate Congress*, VII. 454, 455, 465-467, 490-492, 659, 660. In the entry of January 16, 1865, a flaming quotation from the *Richmond Sentinel* headed "Treason" seems to be an attack on Foote.

⁹The aristocratic tendency of the new commonwealth may be seen in the ratio of slaves to population as this was established when society became well settled upon the new soil. In 1850 the order of the states in respect to the proportion of their population connected with slave ownership was as follows: South Carolina, 53.1; Louisiana, 46.1; Mississippi, 44.6; Florida, 42.5; Georgia, 42.0; Alabama, 39.2; Virginia, 35.1. That these were, with one exception, the more distinctly aristocratic states is borne out by their general attitude in social and political history. Georgia, it should be remembered, was practically two states, socially, and it was the eastern, aristocratic section which brought Georgia into the list above. The more democratic states—North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Texas—show percentages ranging from 29.0 downward. *Century of Population Growth*, p. 138. As to the proportion of slaves to whites in 1850, Mississippi stood second with 105 slaves to every 100 whites. Only South Carolina exceeded this ratio with 140 to the hundred. *Ibid.*, p. 140. The census of 1850 showed that in Mississippi one-half the non-urban population held slaves. In only three other states—South Carolina, Louisiana, and Alabama—was this the case. *Compendium of the Seventh Census*, p. 94.

ments were sufficiently buoyant to enable them to apprehend it, as if an actual experience of the sensibilities, even before it had materialized. Their own emotions when at last they should occupy such an estate was what in advance they vividly anticipated, what constituted to their romantic minds the end of the rainbow.

Their temper is best appreciated, perhaps, by contrasting it with that of an illustrious community farther to the eastward. South Carolina in 1835 had long since emerged from the plastic but indeterminate wealth of opportunity in which Mississippi then revelled. In contrast with the new state where no one had had time to forget he had originated elsewhere, South Carolina had acquired that sense of being the fruit of its own soil which is the gift of a ripened civic life. In South Carolina the conservative impulse had had time to appear and become established. To preserve what was already there, far more than to attain what was yet to be, was the typical mood of the East. Therefore, not only ends but means appeared to it vital. Knowing just what it had and just what it wished to preserve, the keynote of South Carolina's thinking was conservation. In Mississippi, careless of the means, they centred their thought upon the golden end and the keynote was expansion. Disillusioned South Carolina had long since ceased dreaming of fairy gold at the rainbow's end. Mississippi knew that under the sunset it was a fact.

It was in this elastic young community that Davis passed almost the whole of the eight years between his withdrawal from the army and his entrance into politics. He had inherited some property which appears to have been skillfully handled and increased by his elder brother, Joseph Emory Davis. By this able man the family fortunes were established and a recognized place secured in the forming aristocracy of the state. As far back as 1824, his influence probably had secured for his younger brother the cadetship at West Point.¹⁰ In 1835 he was important, a commanding figure. Though a Democrat he had gone over, in the bud of his fortunes, to that new phase of democracy which retained Jeffersonian theories while practising aristocracy. A risen man, he was a born "founder", the type England invariably seizes to "reinforce" the House of Lords. The same may be said of his brother, Jefferson. Their plantations—Hurricane, the home of the elder brother, and the more noted Brierfield, the seat of the younger—witnessed during those peaceful years a gracious round of life not lacking in cultivation. Both men were lovers of books. Jefferson had real training of the mind, the fruit of Transylvania and West Point. Joseph had

¹⁰ See Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, p. 24.

read law, had the lawyer's aptitude for reason, and was by nature a thinker if not a student. In spite of the newness of their surroundings, their lives had a savor of learning. In the houses which they built, in the régime which they established, was a generalized reflection of the corresponding conditions in the southern East; a shadow of the classic revival of that day in their architecture; a wealthy repetition of what was esteemed luxurious in their appointments.¹¹

Just at the opening of these eight years of Davis's readjustment occurred the first of that series of calamities which made his career as a whole tragic. His first wife died suddenly, less than three months subsequent to their marriage. The impressionable nature of her husband was for a time deeply overclouded. His peace was not recovered without much internal struggle. His only foreign journey previous to his greatness was a West Indian visit in the period of his depression. By degrees, however, the natural buoyancy of his nature returned to him. Probably the happiest portion of his life was still to come; and in the joint fact of the depth of his despair and the completeness of his recovery there is a light on his character. Later witnesses, in the hour of his greatest woe, have left unsympathetic observation of his nervousness.¹² How different all this from the splendid war minister described by Schurz! It is different, too, from the inflexible dreamer of his last phase. And yet in his emotional history between twenty-seven and thirty-five surely there are discernible those conflicting traits which later were to develop into discords.¹³ For the moment they

¹¹ Mrs. Davis gives a really charming picture of life at Brierfield and Hurricane in the *Memoir*, I. 171-180 and 191-195. Professor Fleming adds some delightful details of relations with inferiors in "Jefferson Davis, the Negroes, and the Negro Problem", *Sewanee Review*, XVI. 406-427 (October, 1908). Among them is the following letter to an old slave written almost at the close of Davis's life and published after his death in the *Jacksonville Times-Union*, January 9, 1890: "Both Mr. and Mrs. Davis are thankful to their friend, Milo Cooper, for the lemons and for his congratulations. Mr. Davis passed his eightieth birthday in good health and spirits for one of his age, and is cheered by the kind spirit evinced by so many friends. Your Friends, Jefferson and V. H. Davis."

¹² Sympathetic observers have left similar testimony. Mrs. Davis, describing the effects on him of nervous dyspepsia and neuralgia, says he would come home from his office "fasting, a mere mass of throbbing nerves, and perfectly exhausted". Quoted in Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin*, p. 332.

¹³ Two features that still await complete observation are his religious responsiveness and the influence of women. Professor Fleming ascribes to him the same trust in a special Providence that Jackson had. "The Religious Life of Jefferson Davis", *Methodist Review*, April, 1910. Though no scandal has ever been hinted in connection with Davis, his enemies have accused him of excessive response to feminine influence. For example, there is Pollard and his ever-ready malice.

were harmonized and serenity recovered, perhaps, in part, through his second marriage, though this did not occur until after the close of the eight-year period, not until 1845. Miss Varina Howell, who became the Mrs. Davis of history, was one more instance of the cosmopolitan cast of Mississippi life. She sprang from a great family of New Jersey; her father was a cousin of Aaron Burr.

In 1843, at the age of thirty-five, Davis entered politics. He was tried out, so to speak, by the Democratic management in a forlorn hope against a popular Whig candidate for the legislature. Though Davis lost—as apparently he was expected to do—he showed his mettle. Two years later his party rewarded him with a seat in Congress. Only an extreme partizan of Davis would claim for him a commanding position in the Twenty-ninth Congress.¹⁴ In the main he followed creditably the lead of Calhoun. It is noteworthy that in his first term of Congress he became associated with Rhett and Yancey; from that time date the rivalries of these three, all so gifted, all predestined to despair.

By a curiously dramatic stroke of fate, the three were intimately associated fifteen years later at Davis's inauguration as President of the Confederacy. Yancey made the public address of welcome when Davis arrived at Montgomery¹⁵ and Rhett was on the committee appointed by the provisional Senate to inform him officially of his election.¹⁶ But this was almost their last act together; and almost immediately the bitterness of their later jealousies appeared. Even before the inauguration Rhett had criticized Davis and before the end of the month his organ, the *Charleston Mercury*, had begun its career of opposition.¹⁷ We are now on the brink of the time when Yancey was to crystallize his anti-Davis reaction by saying in the Confederate Senate that he preferred a Northern conquest to the Davis "despotism".¹⁸ What had made possible after fifteen years of political comradeship this sudden and staggering reaction?

That Davis and Rhett were foredoomed to their final bitterness is undeniable if they and their states had the contrasting signifi-

¹⁴ Well summarized in Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, pp. 70-78.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

¹⁶ *Journals of the Confederate Congress*, I. 40. "The President . . . leaning on the arm of Mr. Rhett . . . proceeded amidst the enthusiastic greetings of the assembled multitude . . . to the hall of Congress. Mr. Davis was then introduced by Mr. Rhett to the Congress." *Charleston Mercury*, February 22, 1861.

¹⁷ In announcing the Confederate cabinet, the correspondent of the *Mercury* was outspoken in his condemnation of Davis for not giving the State Department to South Carolina. He went so far as to name Rhett as the one man of all others entitled to the office. *Mercury*, February 26, 1861; see also Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, pp. 221-222.

¹⁸ Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, p. 283.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXI.—6.

cance I have assumed. And when we consider the history of the Democratic party the long delay in revealing a difference wholly irreconcilable ceases to be strange. During all those fifteen years they were leaders of a party of opposition. Their issues were determined by their opponents. The conception of a nationalized government minus slavery was as deadly to the social system of Mississippi as to the political theories of South Carolina. To Davis, no less than to Rhett, the discrediting of that conception was the ruling impulse during the long and brilliant chapter which includes both his terms in the Senate and between them his tenure of the Secretaryship of War. Their common aim being to defeat an enemy, what need for them to develop the incompatible ideals which at the backs of their minds animated their endeavors? Rhett, and his course in the Confederacy—the course of the ultra states' rights men—still awaits a biographer both sympathetic and analytical.¹⁹ But that Rhett's ideal could never really harmonize with Davis's more broadly sectional, less sophisticated ideal becomes more and more plain.

Those fifteen years of his career as a statesman of opposition reveal to us something which the previous eight years of his reorganization left uncertain. That earlier period, if my theory is true, revealed his character, massing the image upon five great lines: sensibility, courage, reaction to a generalized environment, the new man's preoccupation with a vision essentially social, the militarist's preoccupation with ends rather than means. The chapter between 1845 and 1860 shows us his cast of mind. One faces the question: was he genuinely intellectual?

It might serve as the issue in a long and interesting debate. Two points are as much as one may consider in so brief a discussion as this. Professor Dodd, always sympathetic, but always detached, calls him incidentally "something of a martinet".²⁰ Mr. Bradford, whose attitude may be described as gracious rather than sympa-

¹⁹ No figure of the Confederacy is a finer challenge to the student, but his manuscripts are still, unfortunately, unavailable for study; and though several people are known to be at work upon his life, nothing of importance has appeared. He is the very type of the thoroughgoing states' rights man who was animated by a real love for his particular state—as real as a Bulgarian's for Bulgaria—who was as resolute not to have his state submerged in the Confederacy as is the modern Bulgarian not to have his own country submerged in, say, a united Byzantine Empire. Very able students have failed to comprehend that South Carolina, in 1861, felt that same idealizing passion for the "little country" which these same students find easy to comprehend in the Balkans.

²⁰ *Jefferson Davis*, p. 26. Professor Phillips, perhaps with this phrase in mind, makes him "the unapproachable martinet". *Life of Robert Toombs*, p. 226.

thetic, uses various anecdotes, also incidentally, with a like effect.²¹ It is to be feared their impression is correct. And if it is, here is one damaging conclusion as to the quality of his mind. Though he is capable of surprising us with his occasional magnanimity and largeness of view, as in some of his letters to Lee,²² more often, as in certain tart messages to Congress,²³ and in the rebukes he was capable of administering to his generals,²⁴ he reminds one unpleasantly of the schoolmaster. Let us go further and say, the drill-master. Needless to insist that a soldier of this type is never a first-class mind. Davis's fixed belief that he was fit for the highest place in war²⁵ was surely an illusion. It prepares us for the pathetic illusions of his last phase.

But there is another point, intellectually. Davis at the outset of his career accepted the political theories, the political phraseology, of the states' rights party. In innumerable utterances—speeches, letters, messages—he rang the changes on that phraseology. But did he ever assimilate the ideas which it involved, did he ever see where his political philosophy must inevitably lead him? Other men of the time saw. Calhoun, with his vast logic, perceived, through sheer lucidity of mind, where his theory pointed, and strove with all the force of his nature to keep from travelling the inevitable road. Webster, with his powerful imagination, saw. Even such lesser men as Rhett and Yancey, once the die was cast and the Southern states were committed to a joint struggle against military power, saw what was likely to happen, saw that their theory might be slain in the house of its friends,²⁶ and they turned desperate.

²¹ See his chapter on Lee and Davis, in his delightful *Lee, the American*, pp. 48-73.

²² For example, his refusal to accept Lee's resignation following Gettysburg: "Suppose, my dear friend, that I were to admit with all their implications the points which you present, where am I to find that new commander who is to possess the greater ability which you believe to be required? . . . To ask me to substitute you by some one in my judgment more fit to command, or who would possess more of the confidence of the army, or of reflecting men in the country, is to demand an impossibility." *Memoirs*, II. 398.

²³ As when, at an acute crisis, he irritated the Senate by telling them with regard to a bill just passed, "much benefit is expected from this measure though far less than would have resulted from its adoption at an earlier date". *Journals of the Confederate Congress*, IV. 704.

²⁴ He once replied to J. E. Johnston that the language of a letter "is, as you say, unusual; its arguments and statements utterly one-sided, and its insinuations as unfounded as they are unbecoming". Rhodes, *United States*, III. 459.

²⁵ "The President was a prey to the acutest anxiety during this period, and again and again said, 'If I could take one wing and Lee the other, I think we could between us wrest a victory from those people'." *Memoir*, II. 392.

²⁶ These fears made their appearance even in 1861 but do not seem to have come to a focus until the passage of the first act to suspend habeas corpus in

We can imagine a man of immense humor—that quality so conspicuously lacking in American statesmen—placed as Davis was, and winking with a gust of laughter to the fact that for fifteen years he had talked one thing while he meant another, talked the constitutional rights of the individual states while what he really meant was the economic interests of a consolidated South. Such a man, winking thus, would have admitted that in the interests of the South as a whole—that generalized social ideal of a certain manner of living which was his real inspiration—he would destroy an individual Southern state as ruthlessly as, in the interests of the Union as a whole, Webster might have done so. But Davis contrasts with each of these types, with all. He clung to the phraseology of states' rights as stubbornly even as Rhett, or Stephens, who genuinely believed it. And yet when occasion finally tested him, behind his words, striking through his words, appears something quite different—the Southern Nationalist.²⁷ With this clew afforded by

February, 1862. "The Congress of the Confederate States of America do enact that during the present invasion of the Confederate States the President shall have power to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus in such cities, towns, and military districts, as shall, in his judgment, be in such danger of attack by the enemy as to require the declaration of martial law for their effective defence." *Digest of the Military and Naval Laws of the Confederate States of America*, paragraph 396. The friction between the Richmond government and the state of Georgia dates from that time. See Fielder, *Life of Joseph E. Brown*. In July Governor Brown wrote to Stephens: "I deeply regret that the President, whom I have regarded as a leading State Rights man, should have given in his adhesion to the doctrines of unlimited congressional powers." *Report*, American Historical Association, 1911, II. 597. Stephens, in his speech at Crawfordsville in November of the same year, which is reported in Cleveland, *Alexander H. Stephens in Public and Private*, pp. 749-760, squarely asserted that independence was not worth having at the price of constitutional liberty and that the idea of getting independence first and constitutional rights afterward was false, because "our liberties once lost may be lost forever". There is an enormous mass of protest in this same vein. It grows in bitterness as well as in volume during the next two years, until, in 1864, what had become a widely popular view was expressed by a member of the North Carolina senate who declared that "instead of a confederacy of free and sovereign States, we have established a most powerful consolidated military despotism". *North Carolina Standard*, June 10, 1864, quoted by Schwab, *The Confederate States of America*, p. 192. Even more extreme is the passage which the *Charleston Mercury*, a few months later, thought worthy of reproduction from the *Montgomery Mail*: "The tendency of the age, the march of the American people, is toward monarchy; and unless the tide is stopped we shall reach something worse than monarchy. Every step we have taken in the last four years has been in the direction of military despotism. Half our laws are unconstitutional." *Charleston Mercury*, November 16, 1864.

²⁷ One of his most interesting papers is the short message of January 22, 1862, vetoing a bill which provided for "a regiment of volunteers . . . to be raised by the State of Texas . . . the Secretary of War shall incorporate it into the Provisional Army of the Confederate States" but with the control of the regiment remaining in the Texan executive. Davis rejected the bill because con-

the actions of his later career we pick our way among the utterances of 1845–1860, while an impression of disappointment grows. This man, who is so confident in his assertion of states' rights, whose lofty courage is so unfaltering, does not really understand himself. His political philosophy is not a true vehicle for his basal impulses—as Calhoun's was, as Webster's was—but a mere weapon caught ready to his hand from the hands of its makers, the men whom it genuinely expressed. Behind stands ironically the shadow of the coming events that are to expose his self-deception, that are to reveal him as a thinker at second hand.²⁸

trol over all troops should be "vested in the Executive of the Confederate States", and because of "other objections which are mainly important because they disturb the uniformity and complicate the system of military administration". *Messages and Papers of the Confederacy*, I. 160. This promptness to consider the South as a whole appeared to Davis himself as mere soldierly common-sense. But was not the real mainspring deeper laid? His enemies thought so. Witness the long and even vindictive contentions between the Richmond government and those of Georgia and North Carolina. The quantity of data in this connection is bewilderingly great. Though none of these inner movements of the Confederacy have yet been adequately studied it is plain that the conscription laws, the suspension of the habeas corpus, the seizure of supplies, and the cotton policy of the government, were all causes of bitter resentment and distrust. It is well to note the difference of tone between real states' rights men, reluctantly accepting these measures as the dictates of necessity, and the tone of Davis. For example, Toombs, in a private letter of June 10, 1863, wrote with regard to Georgia: "We can do nothing now in establishing any state policy whatever, we must wait for that until after the war. The necessities of war control the entire industry of the country and I fear is greatly endangering public liberty." *Report*, Am. Hist. Assn., 1911, II. 619. In Davis's utterances, on the other hand, there is never a tentative or doubtful note. A most significant symptom is the rhetorical cast of all such utterances. He offsets the objections to his centralizing measures by lofty reiterations of the abstract idea of states' rights, or by denunciations of the enemy for violating them. This falls in with the fact that his fame was made in opposition. It is in opposition that a rhetorical statesman shines. Innumerable passages in his letters and messages deal with this dilemma of the states' rights cause in the positive tone appropriate to a simple situation, and in a rhetorical style. As in the message of February 3, 1864, calling for another act to suspend habeas corpus: "It has been our cherished hope—and hitherto justified by the generous self-devotion of our citizens—that . . . we might exhibit . . . the proud spectacle of a people . . . achieving their liberty and independence after the bloodiest war of modern times without the necessity of a single sacrifice of civil rights to military necessity. But . . . discontent, disaffection, and disloyalty are manifested among those who, through the sacrifices of others, have enjoyed quiet and safety at home." *Messages and Papers*, I. 396.

A most interesting comment on this lack of mutual comprehension between President and people is that of Professor Schwab, who, however, for all his diligence and acuteness, remains always external in sympathy: "Such exercise of arbitrary power by the military and central government necessarily . . . opened the eyes of even the States rights *doctrinaires* to the possibilities of a centralized military despotism." *The Confederate States of America*, p. 208. That word "*doctrinaire*" in this comment might focus a debate upon the historical imagination.

²⁸ The rhetorical element in Davis seems to precipitate a tendency in which

The lack of an underlying intellectual unity predestined him to an appearance of inconsistency as the leader of a movement for states' rights²⁹ and yet closed his mind to that analytic faculty which was the one thing—unless it had been the sense of humor, which

some of us find the characteristic note of nineteenth-century American history. Did not theoreticity appear in the early part of the century and become very soon a dominant note in our political thinking? A few great figures escaped it. Lincoln takes much of his strong color as a statesman because of the powerful contrast between his deeply realistic mind and the more formal, more deductive intelligences that were massed for his background. But could any statesman for whom politics, fundamentally, were "a condition not a theory" have ignored the reality of ideas as Davis ignored the states' rights idea whenever it got in his way? To suppose that ideas are not part of the "condition" which great statesmen set themselves to solve is to err profoundly. Surely, a dim perception of ambiguity was one cause of the opposition to Davis of so many hard-headed, practical people. Said Representative Leach of North Carolina: "What was loyalty in one man three years ago, in advocating the dissolution of the old Union, is treason in another now; and if there be any reconstructionists they certainly have the precedent of the secessionists by which to prove their loyalty." *North Carolina Standard*, September 8, 1863; quoted in *The Confederate States of America*, p. 223. Leach had in mind the agitation then in progress to persuade North Carolina to withdraw from the Confederacy and make a separate peace with the Union. About the same time Jonathan Worth wrote of the editor of the *Standard*: "The 'last dollar and last man' men abuse Holden's peace articles, but the fact that he has the largest and most rapidly increasing circulation of any other journal in the State, indicates the current of public opinion." *Correspondence of Jonathan Worth*, I, 249.

²⁹ The question of inconsistency involves both parties, and modern students as a rule have found it easier to understand Davis than to enter into the minds of his opponents. The world has travelled far in the last fifty years and the historic imagination has not always, by every one, been kept in use. But without it one cannot gauge accurately the motives of the out-and-out states' rights men who found Davis inconsistent, and worse. That the "revolution", in their eyes, was a movement not only for independence but also for a definite system of government, cannot be insisted on, to-day, too emphatically. Again (as in note 19) the Balkan situation helps us to think of the matter correctly. Rhett and Stephens were as far from being *doctrinaires* as is the modern Bulgarian, the modern Montenegrin. Their position was stated over and over, not only with passion, but also in the most temperate language. For example, ex-Governor Manning in declining to be a candidate for governor of South Carolina said: "To establish the independence of the Confederate States among the nations of the earth, and at the same time to preserve the sovereignty of each State, free from the encroachments of either legislative or executive power, are, it appears to me, the great ends for which the patriotic mind of the country should contend." *Charleston Mercury*, November 12, 1864.

Still earlier Stephens, in that manner which his apologists think detached and some others think sly, wrote "confidentially" that his views on Davis were "much more akin to suspicion and jealousy than of animosity or hate. . . . I have regarded him as a man of good intentions, weak and vacillating, timid, petulant, peevish, obstinate, but not firm. . . . Am now beginning to doubt his good intentions. . . . His whole policy on the organization and discipline of the Army is perfectly consistent with the hypothesis that he is aiming at absolute power." *Official Records*, fourth series, III. 279-280.

he seems entirely to have lacked—that might have saved him. It was this mental—though not moral—inconsistency that led his enemies to see in him, the moment they had crossed the line from opposition to construction, an unscrupulous opportunist.³⁰ The same thing, in that new constructive situation, led Davis, his thought concentrated on ends and indifferent to the means, caring everything for the South but very little for any particular state, to regard Rhett and Stephens, and the passionate loyalty of each to the one state, as mere details of political obstruction.³¹

The internal history of the Confederacy is largely the battle of these irreconcilable ideals. And the attitude of Davis, when assailed by the true states' rights men, further demonstrates his basal failure intellectually. He could not co-ordinate his own mind, could not realize that his note from their point of view rang false. They understood him better than he understood himself. His states' rights phraseology and his long series of centralizing measures³²

³⁰ The antagonism to Davis ranges through all degrees of expression from the smooth regret of Stephens to the fierce bluster of Toombs. Of the latter Professor Phillips's *Correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens and Howell Cobb* (Report, Am. Hist. Assn., 1911, II.) contains some amazing specimens. Here is a choice bit dated May 17, 1862: "Davis's incapacity is lamentable, and the very thought of the baseness of Congress in the impressment act makes me sick. I feel but little like fighting for a people base enough to submit to such despotism from such contemptible sources." In the more dignified tone of the Rhett faction, "we distrust . . . all executive power under the constitution . . . but above all we distrust all arbitrary power sought for an Executive in the midst of public troubles". *Charleston Mercury*, November 15, 1864. It is not strange there were schemes to depose him. Said the administration paper, at Charleston: "We have been reliably informed that men of high official position . . . are . . . preaching a crusade against President Davis and calling for a general convention of the Confederate States to depose him and create a military dictator in his place." *Charleston Daily Courier*, May 2, 1862. In January, 1865, it was proposed to censure him in Congress and Bocoock of Virginia wrote him confidentially that if the proposal came before the House it would pass by a three-fourths vote. *Official Records*, first series, vol. XLVI., pt. II., p. 1118.

³¹ How little Davis allowed for average human feeling appears in connection with the Georgian situation, autumn, 1864. With Sherman victorious in the midst of the state, citizen soldiers might be expected to insist on going home to protect their families. To Davis, who seems not to have distinguished between the citizen soldier and the professional soldier, such action was commonplace desertion. Nor could he make allowances for the willingness of Georgians to treat with Sherman direct. On October 12, 1864, Governor Brown wrote to Stephens: "I see Mr. Davis in his speech at Columbia refers to the traitorous conduct of states that would attempt to negotiate", etc. *Report*, Am. Hist. Assn., 1911, II. 653. One is reminded of the comment: "Gifted with some of the highest attributes of a statesman, he lacked the pliancy which enables a man to adapt his measures to the crisis." Reuben Davis, quoted in Bradford, *Lee, the American*, pp. 69-70.

³² Here is Stephens's recital of them: "That policy does not meet with my

appeared to them irreconcilable. He, on the other hand, genuinely unconscious of inconsistency, the politician in him and the soldier dwelling apart in watertight compartments, never appreciated that those others, for all their limitations, were but pitilessly logical; that they were the natural product of the situation; that anyone who would lead the Southern movement must be equal to convincing them; must, to their full satisfaction, harmonize his own course dictated by necessity with their logical desperation, the last stand of an ideal. But he never realized this intellectual obligation. Their opposition hardened him. Even as the base of his political feeling may have been a neutral ground of indifference to local forms, so at the base of his political thought there seems to have been a spot of callous. Ideas penetrated him only to a certain depth, then glanced off and disappeared. Consequently his position as president, ironic from the first—ironic because no one appears wholly to have desired him for the place, because of the pitiable fact that a revolutionary movement compromised on its administration³³—became steadily more and more ironic. In his own mind the possibility of appreciating the situation, if it ever existed, soon vanished. He became the prisoner of an illusion. The more desperate his situation, the more stubborn his illusion. His course subsequent to the taking of Atlanta³⁴—his futile plan for a “people’s

approval, as developed either in military, financial, legislative, or diplomatic departments of government. Its conscription, its ignoring State sovereignty and the rights of the citizen soldiers in the appointment of officers, its impressments and seizures, its system of passports and provost-m Marshals—its continued issues of paper money, without timely taxation or other steps to prevent depreciation, and its utter neglect of cotton, our greatest element of power, when it could have been of incalculable value to us—to say nothing of other matters—are all wrong, radically wrong in my judgment, both in principle and policy.” Cleveland, *Alexander H. Stephens in Public and Private*, p. 174.

³³ The mystery of the Confederate election is still unsolved. Professor Dodd holds to the view that Toombs had been definitely agreed upon, but that for some reason not yet discovered, there was a reconsideration at the last moment and a compromise upon Davis. *Jefferson Davis*, pp. 219–222. Professor Phillips has a different version according to which there never was an agreement upon Toombs and very little if any concert of action previous to the election. *The Life of Robert Toombs*, pp. 222–225. Mrs. Davis’s *Memoir* reveals no secrets. There was but one ballot for President and the vote was unanimous. *Journals of the Confederate Congress*, I. 40. Contemporaneous accounts by Stephens, T. R. R. Cobb, and Pollard leave the matter in confusion. It is well known that Davis did not desire the office. His ambition was to command the army. *Memoir*, II. 19.

³⁴ From this time forward the psychology of Davis presents some of those problems that make dramatic the last phase of more than one leader who has ended unsuccessfully. His view of the situation becomes so complete an illusion that we might say it had crystallized into fatuousness. See his message of November 7, 1864, with its amazing confidence that Sherman was at the end

war" against Sherman; his unflagging confidence in eventual success; such infatuations as his speech at the African Church, after the failure of the Hampton Roads Conference, with its promise that "before another summer solstice falls upon us, it will be the enemy who will be asking us for conferences and occasions in which to make known our demands";³⁵ the still more tragic infatuation of the "Address to the People of the Confederate States"³⁶ issued after his flight from Richmond to Danville—all this forms the greatest instance of illusion in American history.

And yet—crowning irony of all—his very stubbornness, his very completeness of illusion, led him at the end into what appeared to be the boldest possible elasticity of thought, his audacious scheme of the winter of 1864–1865 to arm the slaves, and even, in large numbers, to set them free.³⁷ But if the theory of him here indicated will hold, that last astounding move was but the final evidence

of his rope, and its conclusion: "There are no vital points on the preservation of which the continued existence of the Confederacy depends. There is no military success of the enemy which can accomplish its destruction." *Messages and Papers*, I. 485. Previously, in a speech at Macon, he had said: "Our cause is not lost. Sherman cannot keep up his long line of communication; and retreat, sooner or later he must. And when that day comes the fate that befell the army of the French Empire in its retreat from Moscow will be re-enacted." (*Richmond Enquirer*, September 28, 1864; quoted in Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, p. 334.) Again, the rhetorician! Promising a Moscow without an army in Napoleon's front and with no "General January" to bring up against him. In fact, if the Napoleonic allusion is to be used at all, it works the other way. Davis, after Atlanta, in the stubbornness of his illusion, reminds one, in a way, of Napoleon after Leipzig.

³⁵ *Richmond Examiner*, February 7, 1865; quoted in Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, p. 353.

³⁶ "Animated by the confidence in your spirit and fortitude, which never yet has failed me, I announce to you, fellow-countrymen, that it is my purpose to maintain your cause with my whole heart and soul; that I will never consent to abandon to the enemy one foot of the soil of any one of the States of the Confederacy; that Virginia, noble State, whose ancient renown has been eclipsed by her still more glorious recent history, whose bosom has been bared to receive the main shock of this war, whose sons and daughters have exhibited heroism so sublime as to render her illustrious in all times to come—that Virginia, with the help of her people, and by the blessing of Providence, shall be held and defended, and no peace ever be made with the infamous invaders of her homes by the sacrifice of any of her rights or territory. If by stress of numbers we should ever be compelled to a temporary withdrawal from her limits, or those of any other border State, again and again will we return, until the baffled and exhausted enemy shall abandon in despair his endless and impossible task of making slaves of a people resolved to be free.

"Let us not, then, despond, my countrymen; but, relying on the never-failing mercies and protecting care of our God, let us meet the foe with fresh defiance, with unconquered and unconquerable hearts." *Messages and Papers*, I. 569–570.

Is it possible not to think of Napoleon refusing the Rhine as a boundary?

³⁷ The episode is traced from the sources in the *American Historical Review*, XVIII. 295–308.

of his rigidity, of his generalized sense of things, his desire for a Southern nation, his carelessness of the special forms, the local feelings of the various states. Just as his peculiar intellectual qualities came at last to their inevitable fruition in the stern illusions of his closing winter, so, in that same time, his distinctive political impulses, which had taken their bent so long before in that fluid community of the changeful West, culminated as we should expect them to culminate in a bold stroke of magnificent opportunism.

And thus he closed, misunderstanding himself and misunderstood by his time. A strange, proud, immensely tragic figure!

N. W. STEPHENSON.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

THE KING'S COUNTY COURT

THE extracts which are printed below have a special interest in one way for the exactness with which they illustrate a passage in Glanvill by a case occurring some years before the probable date of that book. The case coming before the court is that described in Glanvill, IX. 4. The lord refused to accept the relief of his tenant's heir and withheld his father's lands. The heir then got the king's writ, that given in Glanvill, IX. 5, and under that writ, *per breve domini regis*, the expression so frequent in Glanvill, he obtained possession of his inheritance *ex iudicio totius comitatus*. Out of gratitude for the assistance of the monks, possibly financial assistance, and perhaps by a bargain made in advance, he made them the donation of land which gave rise to the charter. This charter is undated but the confirmation charter of the immediate overlord is dated by Mr. Round 1162-1170 (*u. i.*, p. 5), and that of William de Mandeville is dated 27 Henry II. (1181). It adds greatly to the interest of the two charters in another way that the court which makes what is called a *iudicium totius comitatus* in the first is called, by an identification not common in the documents, *curia regis* in the second. See my *Origin of the English Constitution*, p. 70, note 17, and "The Local King's Court in the Reign of William I.", *Yale Law Journal*, April, 1914, note 7. These charters were first printed by John Nichols, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester* (1795), vol. II., pt. I., app., p. 134, and again by J. Horace Round, *The Manuscripts of the Duke of Rutland*, IV. 3-7 (*Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 1905). The two editors differ in a number of readings, but I have adopted those of Mr. Round, except in reading *dominus* instead of *deus* in the phrase *quam reddidit michi dominus*.

Universis Sancte Ecclesie filiis Radulfus Pincerna, filius Willelmi de Etona, salutem. Sciatis quod ego Radulfus postquam relevavi terram meam, assensu matris mee et Hugonis fratris mei, dedi et concessi et hac carta confirmavi deo et Ecclesie Sancte Marie Geroudon et monachis ibidem deo servientibus . . . quatuor carrucas terre in Estwella ex hereditate mea quam reddidit michi dominus per breve domini Regis ex iudicio totius comitatus. . . . Hanc autem donationem fideliter et firmiter tenendam ego Radulfus affidavi pro me et pro heredibus meis et monachi me adiuverunt ad relevandam terram meam.

Willelmus de Mandevilla, comes Essexie, omnibus hominibus suis Francis et Anglis clericis et laicis presentibus et futuris, salutem: Sciatis me concessisse et hac carta mea confirmasse in puram et perpetuam elemosinam Deo et ecclesie Sancte Marie Geroldon' et monachis ibidem deo servientibus quatuor carrucas terre in Estwelle videlicet illas quatuor carrucas quas monachi habuerunt ex donatione Radulfi Pincerne postquam idem Radulfus dirrationavit terram illam in curia domini Regis.

G. B. ADAMS.

CATHERINE II. AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

THE part played by Catherine the Great in the American Revolution has not yet been fully worked out. The Russian archives are bringing to light much new material on the subject. From the official papers and her private correspondence, examined for the present purpose, one sees that the empress, from the very beginning, had clearly defined views on the rights and wrongs of the American question and on the final outcome of the struggle, as well as a determined policy not to interfere in a hostile manner.

Catherine neither liked nor disliked the Americans. She probably knew none of them personally, and cared little about their theories of government. She took an interest in the American Revolution because it affected English and European politics. As early as June 30, 1775, she predicted that America would become independent of Europe "even in my life-time", and a year later she wrote to a friend, "The colonies have told England good-bye forever". During the years of conflict she never for a moment doubted that complete separation from the mother-country was the only solution. In her private correspondence she does not hesitate to say that the colonies are in the right, that England has provoked a useless quarrel, and that the best thing for her to do is to become reconciled with her former subjects.

Although the empress had a high regard for England she had a very low opinion of the men who were at the head of the English government during this period. In her view, the King of England was a good, fatherly sort of man, but not a statesman, and his ministers were petty, lost in small politics, and quite incapable of taking large views. During the time that they were in office the empress treated them with much contempt.

The first humiliation suffered was when they asked her for troops to go to Canada. Lord Suffolk, on June 30, 1775, wrote to Gunning, the English minister, requesting him to ascertain in an indirect and delicate manner whether Russia would be willing to let England have infantry for America. Gunning had a talk with Panin and the empress and put the question to them in a rather vague way and they

answered in a similar manner; but Gunning felt that they understood him, and replied to Suffolk that troops would be granted. On the strength of this the king addressed an autograph letter to the empress, making a formal request for soldiers to go to America; and at the same time Suffolk sent instructions for the arranging of the details, and a contract which stipulated the pay to be granted to the troops and the amount of subsidy for the empress. This brought the matter to the front, and the request was refused. Both Catherine and Panin assured Gunning that he had misunderstood them; they supposed that he asked for soldiers to go to Spain, but it was quite out of the question to send them to America. Catherine dictated a letter to George III. giving her reasons for the refusal and offering him some uncalled-for advice on the subject which must have made him blush with shame. Gunning first threatened, then pleaded, but it did him no good; the matter was ended; England was humiliated and disgraced.

Through her ministers at London and Paris, as well as through Baron Grimm, who had a regular correspondent in Philadelphia and in addition saw much of Franklin, the empress kept closely in touch with the political situation as between Europe and America. In January, 1778, Harris, afterward the first earl of Malmesbury, who represented England in Russia, was instructed to make an offensive and defensive alliance between Great Britain and Russia. Panin and Catherine drew him on to commit himself more and more. At first they objected to the term "offensive", and demanded fuller explanations. The European political situation at the time being something like this—that England was at war with the colonies and France was about to come out openly against her, while Russia expected to enter into a conflict with Turkey—Harris proposed that England and Russia should attack France, but that Russia should not be obliged to fight the Americans nor England the Turks. Harris, apparently, intended these terms merely as a basis for further discussion, but Catherine had learned what she desired and refused without any qualifications to have anything to do with the alliance on any terms.

When, in June, 1779, Spain also declared against Great Britain, Harris was once more urged to secure assistance from Russia. With the help of Prince Potemkin he obtained a private interview with the empress and pleaded with her to assist England with her navy. She declined and told him that if England desired peace she could have it by renouncing the struggle with the colonies. He begged that she should reconsider her stand, and she yielded so far as to request him to write out his propositions and submit them.

This was done and she paid no attention to them. Harris felt that Great Britain had humbled herself enough, but he was obliged to stoop even lower. On November 26 he wrote to Count Panin that England was eager for peace, that the combination against her was very powerful, that she was willing to commit her interests to the hands of the empress, that if England's enemies should refuse to do likewise Russia might use her forces to end the war, and, finally, that England desired to make an alliance with Russia on any terms whatsoever. For three months the offer was ignored and then it was rejected. To add to England's troubles, Catherine announced her famous Declaration of Neutrality and partly on the strength of this Holland, who had become an enemy of Great Britain, claimed Russia's support in her fight.

During the year 1779 there was some talk of mediation. Harris asked for it and Grimm urged Catherine to offer it, but she felt that the time had not yet come. England was not sufficiently humbled, she was not ready to reconcile herself with the colonies and until that was done it was idle to talk of peace. In September, 1780, she wrote to Grimm to the effect that the time had now come to put a stop to the war. On October 27 she drew up a formal offer and sent it to her representatives at the courts of the belligerent powers. Simolin, her minister at London, read the paper to Lord Stormont, who in turn reported its contents to the king. A few days later Stormont returned and announced that England was ready to accept mediation and that peace could easily be arranged if France and Spain would desist from helping the rebels. At the same time he said that, as Austria had offered to mediate the year before, the king would prefer that the mediation should be carried on by the empress and emperor conjointly. The Austrian court was notified by England of the new development and the offer to mediate was accepted. A messenger was sent from Vienna to St. Petersburg with a request that the Austrian capital be designated as the place for the negotiations. In her letter to the emperor on February 4, 1781, the empress agreed to this and appointed Prince Dimitri Galitzin her minister to represent her. She also outlined the problems before the mediators and suggested a solution. England, she said, will not make peace if the colonies are included in the negotiations, France will not lay down her arms if they are excluded, and under the circumstances they will continue to fight. It was for the mediators to find some way out of this tangle. Her plan of procedure would be this: (1) An armistice for two or three years to include every part of the world where fighting was going on. During the interval the belligerents should have an opportunity

to settle their quarrels without, however, discussing the American question. (2) In this armistice the Americans should be included, but the matter would have to be handled very delicately, because England might suspect that the armistice was merely a trap to force her to recognize the independence of the colonies. To meet this difficulty it should be stated in the act of armistice that Great Britain, desirous of bringing about peace, promised to suspend hostilities in the colonies while she was negotiating with the European powers. Some arrangement must however be made so that England should make peace with the colonies, either separately or collectively. France must be made to promise not to take up arms during the time while England was treating with the colonies, so long as the negotiation was carried on in a pacific manner. (3) France would probably desire to come out with glory and honor from her engagements with the colonies. This could be managed by having her assume the guaranty of the agreements made by England and the colonies.

The proposals submitted to the belligerents were in substance as outlined above. Neither side accepted them; they pleased no one; the point of contention was whether the colonies were free and independent or not. The mediation came to an end. Catherine's pride was hurt and she blamed England for her obstinacy in refusing to give up the colonies and for the stupid declaration that she would rather lose all than give in on this point.

While the mediation proposals were being discussed, the English ministry made an unpardonable blunder in attempting to bribe the empress and influence her course as mediator. On October 28, 1780, Lord Stormont inquired of Harris whether Russia's alliance against England's enemies, including the colonies, could not be purchased for a piece of territory. Harris took up the matter with Potemkin and suggested that England might be willing to part with some territory in America or in the Indies. Potemkin replied that England could gain her point by offering the island of Minorca. Harris advised that the alliance was worth the price, especially because the island in question would serve the additional purpose of embroiling France with Russia. To have carried out the bargain on this basis might raise suspicion. Stormont, in his reply, indicated that Russia need not even help in the war, but that if the empress would use her influence to have France withdraw from the colonies and leave the rebels to their fate, Russia might have Minorca. After peace should have been made, then the alliance could be concluded and no one would be the wiser. Catherine made the most of this opportunity to disgrace the ministry. She told

the story to the emperor, who told it to the King of France, and soon Europe was enjoying the situation.

The coming of Fox into power and the recognition of the independence of the colonies paved the way for peace. Before it was finally concluded the empress was invited twice more to intervene, once conjointly with the King of Prussia, but in the end there was no need of her services.

In refusing to recognize an American diplomatic agent before a definitive treaty of peace was made, Russia meant no offense to the United States. During the whole time that Dana was at St. Petersburg the empress was still regarded as a mediatrix. To have received him officially would have compromised Russia, and wounded the pride of England without in the least advancing the interest of the United States. Whatever could be granted unofficially was offered. American ships and merchants were invited to come, and were assured of as much protection and as many opportunities as those of any other nation. Russia demanded that Dana's credentials should bear a date posterior to the recognition of independence of the colonies by England. This point America could not concede, and out of regard for England and her position as mediatrix the empress could not do otherwise but insist. It was best to put off official relations until some future time.

FRANK A. GOLDER.

OFFICIAL MILITARY REPORTS¹

IN regard to the trustworthiness of diplomatic papers a wholesome degree of skepticism prevails, but historical documents of another class are perhaps viewed by many with too much awe. The standard of honor among soldiers is no doubt very high, and, perhaps for that reason, it seems to be supposed quite generally that a faithful study of the military reports prepares one sufficiently to write the history of a campaign. This is by no means the case, however; and possibly a few remarks based upon our war with Mexico may be thought useful.

Both intentional and accidental misrepresentations occur in the reports, and the former are of two kinds—the legitimate and the illegitimate. It was legitimate for a general, bearing in mind that probably his statements would soon become known, to consider their effect on the officers concerned, the army in general, the gov-

¹ As this paper is merely suggestive, there seems to be no need of supporting it with proofs. These, moreover, if presented in full, would nearly double the length of what is expected by the editor to be very brief; and, finally, it is the writer's intention to bring them forward before very long in another place.

ernment, the public at home, the enemy, and the world at large. It was desirable to satisfy, as nearly as this could be done, the demands of the officers, and these were not always reasonable or just; to maintain the spirit of the troops, their confidence in their leaders and their hope of triumph; to gratify the authorities and the people, and thus ensure a hearty support of the war; to mould public opinion abroad, in order to maintain the honor of the nation, excite an inspiring reflex influence, and strengthen the financial credit of the country; and, finally, it was necessary to conceal from the enemy whatever facts could be useful or encouraging, and represent the army as invincible. To gain these ends more or less misrepresentation was needed.

Among the illegitimate sources of intentional error was the desire of officers and generals to be regarded as abler and more heroic than in fact they were; and Trist, the negotiator of our treaty of peace, described this wish on the part of many volunteer leaders as almost a mania and undeniably a very serious evil. There is ample reason to believe the substantial accuracy of his charge, General Pillow's case ranking probably at the head in this respect. A strong rivalry existed between regulars and volunteers, and this could hardly fail to affect a general's views, if he chanced to command both. There were friends to please and enemies to punish. An officer sometimes entertained a special desire to compliment a regiment that he had formerly commanded; and every kind of influence except a direct offer of money was apparently used to obtain favorable mention from the reporting generals. As for the unintentional mistakes, they arose primarily, of course, from errors of observation and memory, a lack of data, and misinformation in the statements of subordinates. No commander can see everything in an affair of any importance, or remember all that he sees.

General Taylor received great credit for his reports, but they were written, in fact, by the assistant adjutant-general of his army, W. W. S. Bliss, who was a finished artist in discreetly omitting and sagaciously emphasizing. Bliss never lied and never told the truth, one may almost say. At the battle of Palo Alto there was an opportunity to rout the Mexicans completely by a decisive bayonet charge, but the opportunity was not improved. This is the more surprising because, only the day before, Taylor had formally notified his army that the infantry, which made up almost the whole of it, would be expected to depend in the coming battle upon the cold steel; yet the report makes no reference to this mystery. The explanation is that Taylor, contrary to the advice of his best officers,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXI.—7.

had unnecessarily insisted upon taking with him a large train of loaded wagons, and he feared that, should he charge the Mexican infantry, Arista's heavy force of cavalry—which had already made one lunge at the wagons—might be able, aided perhaps by a portion of the foot, to get at them. In reporting upon the battle of the next day—Resaca de la Palma, as we call it—Bliss failed entirely to explain how the American victory came to pass. Perhaps he did not know, and perhaps he thought it better to focus public attention upon the events directly supervised by Taylor. The chief operations that occurred at Monterey under the general's immediate orders can best be described by the unscientific but expressive word "mess"; but the official accounts do not reveal this fact. With reference to Buena Vista Braxton Bragg, one of the principal heroes, stated to a correspondent that the truth would never become known except from private letters; and he did quite a little himself to bring it out in that way.

Scott for his part made both the unintentional and the legitimate errors and probably invaded the other field also. He stated once in general orders: "In the reports of battles and other operations, in the face of the enemy, omissions and mistakes have been common, and, in fact, with the best intentions, unavoidable." His inspector-general said once that had the commander-in-chief told the full truth in his account of the battle at Cerro Gordo about Pillow's proceedings, the military career of that gentleman would have ended; and certainly it should have ended. After the capture of the City of Mexico Scott failed to give Worth credit for having entered the capital on September 13, and thus left Quitman to enjoy that distinction, though Worth's report lay before him. This was probably a mere oversight; but it helped to make trouble between the commander-in-chief and his able lieutenant. The list of errors could be extended almost indefinitely, but these cases are numerous enough to illustrate the principle. Our practical conclusion is that one must obtain trustworthy information from other sources, and with this correct and supplement the official statements. It may be well to add that reports are not always correctly printed—even by the government. Those relating to the battles of September 8 and 13, 1847, for instance, contain fifty-eight slips worth noting.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

PALMERSTON AND LOUIS NAPOLEON

· ONE of the most familiar episodes in English political history during the nineteenth century is the dismissal of Palmerston from

his post of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on December 19, 1851, in consequence of his approval of Louis Napoleon's notable *coup d'état* of December 2. Disregarding the disputed point as to whether or no the foreign secretary's method of procedure passed the bounds of official discretion, one can say that his attitude was determined by various considerations. He was hostile to the Orleanist dynasty, regarding the recently deposed Louis Philippe as his "most artful and inveterate enemy" and he thought there was evidence of "a contemplated descent upon the French coast by the Orleanist princes, the Duc d'Aumale and the Prince de Joinville", which contributed to precipitate the *coup d'état*.¹ Moreover, assuming, as he did, that the French assembly meant to strike "a sudden blow" at the president, he contended that the latter was quite right on that ground "to strike them down first".² Finally he argued,

that in the conflict of opposing parties Louis Napoleon would remain master of the field, and it would very much weaken our position at Paris, and be detrimental to British interests if Louis Napoleon, when he had achieved a triumph, should have reason to think that during the struggle the British representative took part (. . . by a manifestation of opinion) with his opponents.³

While Palmerston thus had good grounds for supporting the future Emperor of the French, one would naturally assume in addition that he had no apprehension of Napoleonic designs. His own utterances and the commentaries of all writers who have dealt with the subject would seem to indicate that his distrust was first awakened years afterward. On November 4, 1859, he wrote, "Till lately I had strong confidence in the fair intentions of Napoleon toward England, but of late I have begun to feel great distrust and to suspect that his formerly declared intention of avenging Waterloo has only lain dormant and has not died away";⁴ in a celebrated conversation with Count Flahault, March 27, 1860, he stated his fears very frankly but unofficially;⁵ while in April he had got to the point of declaring in a letter to Lord Cowley that "the Emperor's mind is as full of schemes as a warren is full of rabbits".⁶

Curiously enough, while Malmesbury's *Memoirs of an Ex-Min-*

¹ Lloyd C. Sanders, *Life of Viscount Palmerston* (London, 1888), p. 143; Evelyn Ashley, *Life of Viscount Palmerston* (London, 1876), I. 287 ff.

² Ashley, I. 291.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II. 189.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II. 191.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II. 182.

ister has been cited by many among their authorities, none have called attention to a remarkable conversation therein recorded which took place in March, 1852, only three months after the *coup d'état*. Palmerston had kindly arranged to call upon his inexperienced successor, Lord Malmesbury, foreign secretary in Derby's first ministry. During the course of the conversation,

He said that the advent of Louis Napoleon was a good thing for France, and from the extraordinary figures of the *plébiscite*, proved she was weary both of Bourbons and lawyers; but that, as it was quite possible his tendencies might be to avenge his uncle's fate, we must turn all our attention to strengthening our national defenses both by forts and an increase of armaments.⁷

In conformity with his views thus confidentially expressed he had just overthrown his late chief Lord John Russell by advocating a stronger militia bill than the latter had framed. Whether his suspicions languished from lack of nourishment or whether he suppressed them in view of the larger common interests of Great Britain and the existing French government, certainly he gave them no further voice for years to come, he co-operated loyally with the emperor in the Crimean War and was overthrown in 1858 for his Conspiracies to Murder Bill framed in Napoleon's interest. However, the striking fact is that from the very beginning he stood by him with his eyes open to possible consequences.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

CONSCRIPTION IN THE CIVIL WAR

A SEMINARY conducted during the current year on the administrative problems of the Civil War opened a most fruitful field. At no time have the relations of state and nation been more interesting, and, provincial and ill managed as the war was, it marked in many important aspects, particularly in the attempt to provide for the welfare of the troops and the comfort of those left behind, the beginning of the modern military organization of the state.

The particular problem which has heretofore received the most attention has been that of the draft, in which renewed interest has been aroused by the discussion of conscription in England. Not a week goes by in which lances are not broken in the English press over the wisdom and necessity of our draft system. Yet its character and effect seem to have escaped both the historian and the journalist. It is a subject well worth a doctor's thesis, and has been undertaken by a Wisconsin student with the doctorate in view. However, a few results of a preliminary study which was worked

⁷ *Memoirs of an Ex-Minister* (ed. 1885), p. 238.

out with considerable detail with reference to Wisconsin seem to be worth publishing at this time.

The total number of enlistments before the national draft law of 1863 was 1,356,593, of which about 87,000 may be credited to the state draft ordered in August of the previous year. The enlistments after the draft law went into effect numbered 1,120,621. Thus more than half the Union army was raised on the strictly volunteer basis. Moreover, of the enlistments after the law was in effect only 61,950 were of men actually drafted. Evidently the United States draft bore a very slight resemblance to the present Continental, or for that matter to the Confederate, conscription, of which the purpose was and is to select by mechanical means, from the whole population held to military service, those whom it seems desirable to the state to employ. Under the Continental system the government exempts from service those whose economic loss to the community would be most serious, and takes from those that remain, and who are fit, the required number by lot. It is obvious that in the North the selection was actually in the vast number of cases made by the individual. The draft law was so framed and administered as not to create a substitute for the volunteer system, but to stimulate volunteering.

Each state was required to furnish its proportional quota for each call. If the quota could be filled by volunteering, there was no draft, and there were several instances in the case of the later calls where states fulfilled this condition. If the draft went into effect, the men whose names were drawn could escape, by being exempt under the provisions of the act, which of course included physical disability, or by hiring a substitute. 101,431 substitutes were thus furnished. Until the original act was amended in 1864, those drawn could, moreover, escape simply by the payment of three hundred dollars commutation money.

This last provision was as impracticable as it was undemocratic. The state of Delaware voted to pay the commutation money of all its drafted citizens. Counties and towns elsewhere did the same, and clubs were formed to buy out any of their members drawn. With a total enrollment of about three million and a half men liable to the draft, a call for three hundred thousand would mean for each individual one chance in eleven or twelve of being drawn. With a club of one hundred, a fifty-dollar payment would amply secure every member, and would not be an exorbitant payment for insurance against paying three hundred. The draft proved profitable

financially, but men were needed and not money, and this clause had much to do with the opposition to the draft in poorer communities, such as New York City, which justly felt that it discriminated against the poor.

The provision with regard to substitutes was also unjust, and similar means were taken by which the individual responsibility of providing for them might be spread over the community by taxation or over a group by club organization. It had the merit, however, of providing the government with men instead of money, and moreover, the substitute voluntarily accepted service. In fact the substitute was able to dictate terms, and soon individuals, clubs, and communities were bidding against each other in the effort to secure those available, prices often rising to one thousand dollars. In addition, the chance of having to provide substitutes increased the effort to anticipate the draft altogether, by completing the quota through volunteering. The cost of getting men to volunteer under the call of the government was less than that of hiring them as substitutes for other men, and the mental satisfaction on both sides was greater. Consequently the same counterbidding and similar extravagant bounties were employed to induce men to volunteer from particular communities before the draft, as for substitutes where it had gone into effect.

The result was that the draft law, instead of settling everyone's duty and introducing the order and quiet of European war-time, created three million and a half recruiting agents, combined into groups of varying sizes, calculating the amount they could pay to escape service, or could secure for serving. The turmoil reached across the Atlantic and brought over some, not many, who were anxious for the rich bounties or were entrapped by speculators who hoped to secure generous commissions. It involved the states in the undignified squabbles of their agents in the South, seeking to fill home quotas by enlisting negroes. Of the 87,000 credited to the state draft in 1862, very few were actually drafted men, and aside from these few only 62,000 served because they were drafted. Thus the Northern army continued to consist in an overwhelming degree of men who chose to serve. Nor is it at all necessary to believe that the majority were induced to serve by the bounties. The typical American young man, however burning to defend the Union, might shrewdly look about to enlist where the pay was highest, but it is highly probable that the army under the draft law drew on the whole the same men who would have served without

it, and it did not lose its characteristic as a volunteer force. The draft may have been a necessary lash to apply to volunteering, or it may not, but in any study of the fighting effectiveness of armies or the economic effectiveness of war-time industry, the North must be classed among the regions employing the voluntary rather than the compulsory system of selection for military service.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

DOCUMENTS

*Dr. John McLoughlin's Last Letter to the Hudson's Bay Company,
as Chief Factor, in charge at Fort Vancouver, 1845*

IN almost every history of Oregon is "quoted" the order said to have been given by Governor Simpson, of the Hudson's Bay Company, to Dr. John McLoughlin, chief factor at Fort Vancouver on the Columbia River—"King of the Columbia", the Americans called him. As given, Simpson's order was: "Starve or drive out every American in the country". No authority is ever cited: the story is sufficiently interesting to need no authority; and dramatic emphasis is added by "quoting" McLoughlin's answer. His reply, given with great dignity, it is said, was, "Then, gentlemen, I will serve you no longer", and he forthwith resigned an excellent salary as chief factor, retiring to private life among the Americans in the Willamette Valley. The date, as given, is anywhere from 1829, when there was but one French-Canadian farmer in the valley and no Americans at all, up to 1844, when several thousand Americans were in or near that valley, and starving out would have been as difficult as driving out.

The story has been repeated in the Old Oregon country so often that it is given as convincing proof of the hostility of the British, especially as represented by the Hudson's Bay Company, to American settlers. It has even found a place in recent books whose authors might easily have been better informed. The present writer, during a year of Oregon researches in London, had access to all the pertinent papers of the Public Record Office from 1790 up to 1860—the latter date marking an unusual extension of privileges—and also to the archives of the Hudson's Bay Company. In the latter case, permission was granted by the late Lord Strathcona, governor of the Company, and carried out with great kindness and courtesy by its secretary, F. C. Ingrams, Esq. Thus I had the opportunity of looking over and taking notes from old journals, despatches, letters, and notes of all descriptions, from about the time that Dr. McLoughlin arrived on the Columbia, up to 1847, after the treaty had been signed. Careful study of these letters and papers is fatal to the notions respecting British aggressiveness current at that time among Americans in the Oregon country and elsewhere.

The long letter printed below gives the actual facts respecting Dr. John McLoughlin's resignation as chief factor for the Company, and its motives. There had always been differences of business judgment between Governor Simpson and Dr. McLoughlin; for instance, in regard to the problem of the coasting trade from the Columbia River to Sitka. Both men were masterful, imperious, and both were possessed of exceptional business judgment and a rare devotion to their work. Either plan, it would seem, would have been successful; but one or the other would have to yield. Simpson, with a bird's-eye view over the entire trade, felt that his judgment must rule; McLoughlin, with supreme attention to his own particular territory, and his whole life and thought given to the advancement of the Company's interest, had a similar feeling with regard to his own judgment.

Yearly letters, when differences of business judgment occur, do not mend matters, and while there was nothing whatever derogatory in the action, as has often been charged, McLoughlin was directed to return to London in 1836 to discuss an outline for the Oregon business with the Governor and Committee, at which of course Simpson, as governor in North America, would be present. The order probably reached McLoughlin in the summer of 1836, on the London ship, for he seems to have had no time to plan for his absence. He did not go; but he wrote to the Company that the lateness of the London ship had deranged his plans somewhat, and furthermore, that his immediate absence from Fort Vancouver would interfere with Finlayson's projected visit to Sitka. In 1837, just recovering from a serious illness, he did not feel able, as he explained to the Company, to stand the hardships of either the long overseas voyage, or the overland journey and that via Montreal to London. In 1838, however, he went to London and some of his subordinates, including Archibald McDonald, thought he had left the Oregon country for good. But he returned with an advanced salary, with increased powers, and with well-laid plans for the development of the Puget Sound Agricultural Company, this company being distinct from yet embodied in the Hudson's Bay Company. All the stockholders of the new concern were stockholders in the fur company.

That there was not at this time the dissatisfaction with his work which has been implied by this misnamed "recall", is shown by McLoughlin's letter to London of November 15, 1836, thanking the Governor and Committee for confirmation of advanced salary made by the northern council, under Governor Simpson:

Permit me to thank Your Honors for sanctioning the grant proposed by the Northern Council which in my estimation is not valued so much in a pecuniary point of view as in its being a gratifying expression of general approbation the more soothing to my feelings from having in the course of my management had to contend with opinions directly opposed to mine, and to combat (when in novel circumstances of great difficulty which compelled me to step boldly out of the beaten path of routine) the views and declared statements of many whose opinions on other subjects I highly respect.

Without some such decided mark of your preference, I would have been left in doubt with regard to the general estimation of my services, and it is in this light, Gentlemen, that I highly prize the grant and will be ever proud of the recollection that I owe it to the approbation of Your Honors and of my colleagues in the fur trade.

In the light of future events, this letter is of significance, especially in connection with his last official letter to the Company, quoted below, and the statement made by Edward Ellice, one of the Company's Committee, before the parliamentary committee of investigation in 1857, that McLoughlin was a capable man, but he went his own course, and the Company never understood him.

In 1839 McLoughlin returned from London, having sent ahead of him careful directions for farm beginnings at Cowlitz Landing, on the river of that name, and at Fort Nisqually, on Puget Sound. He continued these directions after his return, and "Plough, cross-plough, then harrow and sow, and harrow again", was the burden of many letters. He did not care for farming, as he once wrote John McLeod, who acutely disliked it; yet McLoughlin and James Douglas as well, had a thorough grasp of the subject, and, fur-traders though they were, could quote the most approved agricultural methods of England and give minute directions on stock-raising.

The maze of work over which McLoughlin had direction, and into which he had keen insight, shows why the Hudson's Bay Company could hold its own in the fur-trade against all competition. He had a profound knowledge of the fur-trade, which was his especial business; he conducted, with profit, fur-trading and provisioning with the Russian American Company, and commercial trade in all kinds—deals, spars, shingles, salted salmon, flour, grain, and what-not—with the Sandwich Islands; and besides this the farming, stock-raising, and, last but not least, the control and management of the 80,000 Indians who lived in Old Oregon. No change was made at any post, even at such distant points as Stuart Lake, in the north of British Columbia, that was not made at his direction; or, in emergencies, under a factor or chief trader, with full, detailed report to McLoughlin at Fort Vancouver. There

were always five hundred men or more west of the Rocky Mountains, besides Indian helpers, yet McLoughlin knew the qualifications of nearly every one of them, and shifted men from one post to another with absolute certainty, to bring out given results at any one place.

Two years after McLoughlin's return from London, Governor Simpson, now Sir George, followed him to urge on the new developments, and supervise the extensions of trade and commerce, fur and commercial, in the Columbia District. And at this point difficulties between the two begin. Just how far the new honor had influenced Simpson's self-esteem, or how far McLoughlin had actually gone his own way as against the instructions received in London and in successive despatches, it is hard to say. But nothing was right. The new forts along the coast were ordered abandoned, and one to be begun as soon as possible at the southern end of Vancouver Island; Wilkes's exploring expedition had been in the Columbia, and the Americans had travelled the Oregon country, even to the upper Columbia near 49°, with great energy; the year before, a large number of American "mountain men", driven out of the Rocky Mountains by the decrease of fur-bearing animals, had drifted into the Willamette Valley and taken up "claims"—and a rough, lawless set of men they were, hostile to the British Company, yet demanding assistance of seed-wheat, oxen and ploughs, and clothing from them; other Americans, deserters from whalers along the coast, had also come into the valley; reinforcements of nearly half a hundred new Methodist missionaries had sailed into the Columbia, gone into the Willamette, and taken up farms as colonists, all Americans, of course; petitions had been sent to Congress urging that the United States extend its laws over its own country and its own people to protect them against Indians and "others who would do them harm"; and aside from actual danger to the Company's forts from possible attack by the Americans, the presence of settlers disturbed the Indians with whom they had frequent quarrels, and endangered the peace and safety of every white man in the country thereby, British as well as American. Besides all this, the business arrangement of long-time credit in Oregon, in the Sandwich Islands, and in California, was a source of dissatisfaction to the Company. The Americans have always insisted that this was British antipathy to them; but the correspondence shows there was nothing national about it. The Company did not want business on long-time credit, and there was good reason for it. In the investigation of 1857, an officer stated, under oath, that it was seven years from the time that cash was expended by the Hudson's Bay Company for Indian

trading goods, before the resultant furs were sold and the cash was again in the hands of the Company. With such an expense for interest as this necessitated, or at least very extensive capital, the Company preferred less business and more prompt payment. Furthermore, the wishes of the Company, through misunderstanding or otherwise, had not been followed with regard to headquarters for the California business: a small lot of ground and a house had been purchased at San Francisco or Yerba Buena, instead of the large tract of ground ordered. The lack of obedience here, however, seems to have been due to Mexican mismanagement of provincial affairs; yet Sir George did not forgive it. The management at Honolulu was also somewhat unsatisfactory.

McLoughlin (March, 1842) accompanied Simpson on this voyage down the California coast and to the Sandwich Islands. The notes exchanged between them on this voyage show the strained relations between them—a thing which was noticed by their subordinates and commented upon. But McLoughlin's work was, to him, almost his life; and his plans had been carefully considered and defined. Shortly after this the worst thing happened that could have happened in the eyes of the company. When Simpson went north to Sitka, a second time, *en route* to Russia, a few days before he reached there the Company's men at Fort Stikine had murdered the officer in charge, and that officer was young John McLoughlin. It seems quite likely that Simpson had an active dislike to the young half-breed whom he had rescued from trouble in 1837, in connection with the Canadian rebellion, and had sent far west to his father. But the hastiness of the Sitka investigation, Simpson's unqualified condemnation of Fort Stikine as a "sink of corruption", and his refusal to punish the son's murderers as McLoughlin demanded, or even to send them to Canada for trial were facts which the father never forgave. And this personal grief in the humiliating death of of his son, with the personal bitterness towards his immediate superior, made it that much the harder for McLoughlin to face the open condemnation of Sir George upon all his plans and all his work.

From that situation and not from the friendship which he showed the Americans, developed the personal antipathy between the two which led to McLoughlin's practical dismissal from the Hudson's Bay Company—not by any means a resignation because he refused to starve or drive out the Americans from the country.

McLoughlin's Oregon City claim, also referred to in the letter, has quite a history of its own. In brief, in 1829, when Étienne

Lucier was permitted to settle in the Willamette Valley, the first settler in it, McLoughlin took up for the Company, or for himself by transfer—according as circumstances might develop—a desirable claim at the falls of the Willamette. Before 1825 the British government had notified the Company to build their forts on the north side of the Columbia, as they should not dispute the American claim to the south side—and the Willamette Valley was on the south side—a fact which needs to be borne in mind in considering the fears and misstatements of those early settlers. The climate was mild, and McLoughlin had no wish to return to the rigors of eastern Canada. Looking forward to his own retirement, he took up the claim; yet under his contract with the Company he was not allowed to indulge in any side lines of business or of investment for himself, and therefore took it in the name of the Company and for their benefit, so long as they could legally hold it; then, with his idea of becoming an American, though not with any British antipathy, he could claim it as an individual and pass his old age in comfort. McLoughlin was loud in his praises of the Oregon climate in letters to his friends and to the Company. Sharp practice, however, on the part of the missionary Waller, complicated the whole question and the Company ordered him to relinquish the claim, which he refused to do as he had invested money in it. This was another source of personal difficulty between Sir George Simpson and Dr. McLoughlin.

Throughout McLoughlin's correspondence, his genuine, heartfelt sympathy for the American immigrants shines forth; yet, while following his broad, generous, humane impulses, he would conscientiously fulfill his duty as the representative of a fur-trading company, and live up to his sense of business honor towards his associates and towards his Company. Thus whatever he did for the Americans was done on a business basis, rather than upon an emotional one. To the Americans, he emphasized his feeling of sympathy and friendliness towards them; to the Company, he emphasized his common-sense business attitude towards them. A blending of the two is more nearly the truth.

In printing the letter modern capitalization has been followed, for reasons inherent in the text; the letter, copied by the office clerk at Fort Vancouver, was signed by McLoughlin but not written by him.¹

KATHARINE B. JUDSON.

¹ Upon the subjects of the correspondence in general, reference may be made to Dr. McLoughlin's narrative printed in the *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society, I. 193-206, to another account by him, printed in the *Transactions* of the Oregon Pioneer Association, 1880, and to Sir George Simpson's letters printed by Professor Schafer in the *American Historical Review*, XIV. 70-94.

FORT VANCOUVER, COLUMBIA
20th November, 1845

To

The Governor, Deputy Governor, and Committee,
Honble Hudson's Bay Company.

Honble Sirs,

I informed your Honors in my last communication of the 30th August, 1845, that we had yielded to the wishes of the respectable part of the people in the country, of British and American origin, by uniting with them in the formation of a temporary and provisional Government, designed to prevent disorders and maintain peace, until the settlement of the Boundary Question leaves that duty to the parent States.² That communication, having been forwarded to the Sandwich Islands by the *Chenamus*,³ an American trading vessel and not having implicit confidence in the security of the conveyance, I merely touched upon the known and obvious reasons which induced us to come to this determination, while I withheld the secret motives which had, at least, an equal influence, at the time, upon our minds. I intend now to enter more fully into the subject, trusting your Honors will pardon me if I should happen to be over particular on a matter which I am anxious to lay before you in all its bearings.

2. The critical position of our affairs, the danger to which the large property of the Company in this country was exposed in the midst of a hostile population living without the restraint of laws, and the difficulty of keeping off intruders and maintaining by peaceful means the Company's rights to the land occupied by their improvements and stock, was every day becoming more and more pressing.

3. A crisis was evidently fast approaching which would drive us to the painful necessity of yielding to the storm, or of taking the field openly, arms in hand, with means so unequal compared to those arrayed against us, as to leave no hopes of success. It had become necessary to take decisive measures, yet neither course appeared desirable, as a forced submission or resistance would alike have brought our reputation, influence, and property into the utmost peril. In those trying circumstances the idea of a union for the purpose of mutual protection, with the white population in the Wallamette, was suggested to me while on a visit to the Wallamette Falls, by the following letter from Mr. Applegate,⁴ an American, much respected by his countrymen, and a Member of the Provincial Legislature, then in session:

² The first provisional government had been resolved on at a mass meeting at Champoege on May 2, 1843. After meetings, in 1844 and 1845, of legislative bodies chosen as a part of this provisional government, its constitution was revised into a form accepted by popular vote on July 26, 1845. The legislature came together again on August 5.

³ The *Chenamus* was a Newburyport brig which sailed from the Columbia in the summer of 1845, bound for the States.

⁴ Jesse Applegate (1811-1888), a chief leader in the emigration of 1843 and in the legislature of 1845. See Professor Joseph Schafer's pamphlet "Jesse Applegate, Pioneer and State Builder", in *University of Oregon Bulletin*, vol. IX., no. 6.

" OREGON CITY,
14th August, 1845.

"To John McLoughlin,
Chief Factor of the Hudson's Bay Company,
Sir,

As a question has arisen in the House of Representatives on the subject of apportionment, upon which I feel peculiarly situated, I beg leave to ask of you a question, the answer to which will enable me to come to a definite conclusion on that subject. The question to which I would be happy to receive an answer is,—Do you think the gentlemen belonging to the Company over which you preside will become parties to the "articles of compact" by the payment of taxes, and in other respects complying with the laws of the provisional government?

Your answer to this question is most respectfully solicited.

Yours with highest respect,

(Signed) JESSE APPLGATE."

4. To this letter I made no reply beyond telling Mr. Applegate that I could not decide on a point of so much importance without first consulting the other officers of the Hudson's Bay Company in the Columbia. On my return to Fort Vancouver, I mentioned the matter to Mr. Douglas,⁵ and after much consideration, he agreeing in opinion with me, that neither our rights nor duties as British subjects, nor the honour or interests of the Hudson's Bay Company required that we should stand aloof, we decided on joining the Association both for the security of the Company's property, and for the peaceful maintenance of its rights; and moreover, the Association being merely a union of certain parties, British and American subjects, being divested of all nationality of character, having no national objects in view, and its exclusive aim and purpose being the protection of persons and property, our becoming parties to it could not in any manner interfere with our duties, nor invalidate our claims as British subjects. We were also influenced in this decision by the consideration of the inevitable evils which threatened us and which we could not guard against if we remained isolated from the rest of the community. The first of these was the loss of the Company's servants by desertion, and the ease with which they could fly into the Wallamette Settlement, where they could not be arrested at our suit unless we took part in the Association. To show Your Honors that this danger was not imaginary, though there has been actually no case of desertion from this Post, except in one instance, I am sorry to say that no less than six men, the entire crew of one boat, deserted last summer from the brigade, on its return to the interior, between this place and Fort Nez Percés,⁶ which compelled Messrs. Tod and Manson⁷ to leave the boat and cargo at that post, to the serious inconvenience of the trade.

5. Another powerful inducement arose from the considerable amount of outstanding debts, we have in the Wallamette Settlement, which under the former circumstances of the country we had every reason to think would be punctually paid; but in its newly assumed political posi-

⁵ James Douglas (1803-1877), afterward Sir James, had been on the coast since 1824, had lately been McLoughlin's chief assistant, and was now chief factor and a member of the board of management. He was governor of Vancouver Island 1851-1853, of British Columbia 1858-1864.

⁶ Afterward called Fort Walla Walla; now Wallula, Washington.

⁷ John Tod was chief trader at Fort Kamloop in what is now British Columbia; Donald Manson had charge of the district of New Caledonia.

tion, we would have been cast entirely on the honour and good faith of our customers, as the law could of course only give protection to those who gave it support; but by joining the Association we can sue and attach the property of any man in this country who is indebted to the Company.

6. Again, we had to guard against the designs of many desperate and reckless characters,—men acknowledging no law and feeling not the restraints of conscience, the outcasts of society who have sought a refuge in the wilds of Oregon. With their natural turpitude of disposition embittered by national hostility, such men would not shrink from the connivance of any crime; they were determined at all risks to intrude upon the Company's land claim, and they made no secret of their plans if ejected by force. If not supported by their countrymen, they were to seek an easy revenge by firing our premises, destroying our lands, or such like deeds of cowardly villainy. As an instance of their temper and designs, I may mention that last spring when we were engaged in forcing Williamson off the Company's grounds,⁸ Dr. White, the United States Indian Agent,⁹ informed Chief Factor Douglas that Williamson's party were threatening to burn this establishment, a piece of intelligence that was doubtless intended to scare us into a compromise of our rights. It, however, failed of its effect, as Mr. Douglas very properly answered that he was perfectly indifferent as to consequences, and would not be deterred from the faithful discharge of his duty by menaces of a ruffian; yet it was impossible to conceal from our own minds that we were exposed to so dreadful a calamity. I was also credibly informed that other parties had pledged themselves to destroy our premises.

Now this was precisely our situation at the time we joined the Association. A party adverse to the Company were determined to fasten a claim on some part of our premises, and if resisted by force they were to resort to the acts of skulking incendiary; we had no security for the recovery of our debts, and our men might be tempted by the certainty of immunity and high wages in the Wallamette to desert the Service.

7. We made a representative of our exposed situation to the British Consul General at the Sandwich Islands, who paid no attention to the application further than is contained in the following note addressed to Messrs. Pelly and Allan¹⁰ who having seen a copy of my letter wrote to him also on the same subject.

“H. B. MAJESTY'S CONSULATE GENERAL
HONOLULU, 3rd June, 1845

“*Gentlemen:*

With reference to your letter of the 31st ult. I beg to acquaint you that I have given due consideration to Dr. McLoughlin's communication and that with respect to the suggestion of a ship of war proceeding to the Columbia River, I have had a conversation with Sir Thomas Thompson the Senior Naval Officer amongst these islands.

I am, gentlemen, etc., etc.

(Signed) WILLIAM MILLAR
Consul General.”

⁸ Henry Williamson, an American, had in 1844 begun to build a cabin on land claimed and occupied by the Hudson's Bay Company. McLoughlin had it pulled down before the walls were half up. Later Williamson withdrew.

⁹ Elijah White, sub-Indian-agent.

¹⁰ Agents of the Hudson's Bay Company at Honolulu.

9. The season was also so far advanced that we had no reason to expect the arrival of any Government vessel on the coast.

10. In these circumstances, therefore, we saw no means so well calculated to preserve the rights and property of the Company, to prevent outrage and ruin, to promote British influence, and in other respects, so perfectly unexceptional, as to take part in the Association, and we have since seen no reason to repent our choice.

11. Having come to a decision on this important matter, I immediately returned to the Wallamette Falls where the Legislature was still in session, prepared to act if they made any formal proposition, for bringing about a union. Mr. Applegate soon again introduced the subject, and I discovered in conversation with him, that his object for addressing me the note given in a former page of this despatch was to put us upon our guard with respect to the designs of certain parties in the Legislature who were by no means friendly to us.

He informed me that it had been determined, by a vote of the Assembly, to erect the country north of the Columbia¹¹ into two districts, to be named after Lewes and Clark, under the jurisdiction of the provisional government, in order to meet the wishes of the Americans who then held lands, and of others who intended to settle there. This proceeding he was aware might lead to interference with the Hudson's Bay Company and endanger the peace of the country. In order to avert evils which would involve the people at large in ruinous dissensions, he and many other well-disposed Americans were anxious to have matters so arranged as to leave the management of the district north of the Columbia river entirely in our hands, which could evidently not be accomplished unless we joined the Association. He also observed that although the Executive Committee had, from a sense of justice, strongly expressed their disapprobation of Williamson's conduct last spring, yet as I well knew, they could give no positive assistance to any parties not included in the organization and I am sorry to say, he continued, that Williamson has many abettors in the Settlement, who would seize with avidity any opportunity of creating a disturbance.

12. I told him in reply that I felt extremely obliged by the good feeling shown by himself and friends; that I had always held the opinion that it would be difficult for the subjects of different states to live harmoniously together in a newly settled country like this, claimed by both Governments, and yet neither exercising authority within its bounds, that in consequence it appeared to me absolutely necessary that the inhabitants should unite in forming regulations for their own protection, and that as the organization was simply a compact entered into for that purpose, and in no shape interfered with our duties as British subjects, the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company would, on certain terms, consent to join the Association, providing the Assembly sent us a formal invitation to unite with them.

13. The following letter was soon after brought to me:¹²

¹¹ North of the Columbia, in 1845, there were but half a dozen settlers, with their families, settled around the Tumwater, near the present Olympia. The first Americans to make the effort to settle there, in 1844, turned back; but repeated the attempt the next year. The country south of the Columbia had been organized into four districts, later called counties.

¹² This letter, and that which follows in the next paragraph, are quoted in Bancroft's *Oregon*, I. 495, from the Oregon archives.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXI.—8.

"OREGON CITY, August 14, 1845.

"To John McLoughlin,
Chief Factor of the H. B. Comp'y
Sir,

As a question has arisen in the House of Representatives on the subject of apportionment, upon which we feel peculiarly situated, we beg leave to ask of you a question, the answer to which will enable us to come to a definite conclusion upon that subject. The question to which we would be happy to receive an answer is:

Do you think the gentlemen belonging to the Company over which you preside will become parties to the Articles of Compact by the payment of taxes and in other respects complying with the laws of this provisional government?

Your answer to this query is most respectfully solicited.

Yours with the highest respect,

(Signed) I. W. SMITH
H. A. G. LEE
J. M. GARRISON
BARTON LEE."

14. My reply which had been previously drawn up and signed by Chief Factor Douglas and myself, was as follows:

"OREGON CITY, 15th August, 1845.

"To
I. W. Smith
H. A. G. Lee
J. M. Garrison
Barton Lee } Esquires
Gentlemen,

We have the honor to acknowledge your favor of the 14th instant, and beg in reply to say, that viewing the organization as a compact of certain parties, British and American subjects residing in Oregon, to afford each other protection in person and property, to maintain the peace of the community and prevent the commission of crime, a protection which all parties in the country feel they stand particularly in need of, as neither the British nor American Government appear at liberty to extend the jurisdiction of their laws to this part of America, and moreover, seeing that this compact does not interfere with our duties and allegiance to our respective Governments nor with any rights of trade now enjoyed by the Hudson's Bay Company, we the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company, consent to become parties to the articles of compact, provided we are called upon to pay taxes only on our 'Sales to Settlers'.

We have the honour to be,

Gentlemen,

Your very obed't Serv'ts

(Signed) JOHN McLoughlin
JAMES DOUGLAS."

15. In addition to the terms of compact stated in my letter, another condition was required as indispensable, that the district or north bank of the Columbia that they had named after Lewes and Clark should be called "Vancouver District". This point excited much unpleasant

feeling among the Americans, and gave rise to many angry discussions but was finally carried in our favor by *one* vote, which shows how unpalatable the motion was. That object being gained, we became parties to the Association, and the district officers required to administer the laws (say three judges and a sheriff) were immediately afterwards appointed. These appointments are filled by Chief Factor Douglas, Mr. Forest, and Mr. Simmons, (an American) as judges, the sheriff being Mr. Jackson, (an Englishman settled in the Cowlitz).¹³ In order to obtain the full advantage of the laws of the Association, in regard to land claims, we have had the country around this place surveyed, and had nine lots, each of one square mile, registered in the Recorder's office,¹⁴ to be held for the Company, under the names of

James Douglas, Chief Factor
Francis Ermatinger, Chief Trader
Forbes Barclay, Surgeon and Clerk
Richard Lane, Clerk
James Graham, Do.
Thomas Lowe, Do.
William Bruce, Gardener
Edward Spenser, Apprentice
John McPhail, Shepherd

and we have besides three or four more lots to take, in order to cover the remainder of the Company's ground here. The advantage of this arrangement is that any intruder can be ejected from these claims on a magistrates warrant and the owners right of property protected, without his having recourse to violent means, or even appearing in the arrest, as he has only to prove that the land was registered in his name, and that the other requisition of the land law regarding claims, that is to say, having the four corners marked by stakes or notched trees, and a hut built upon it, had been duly executed.

16. We shall also cover all the valuable points about the Cowlitz Farm and Nisqually¹⁵ in the same manner, so as to put an end, so far as possible, in our circumstances, to contention and strife about land claims.

17. The contributions paid by us towards the support of the Provisional Government amounts this year, as per accompanying statement, to

\$156.15 H. B. Co.
70.50 P. S. Co.¹⁶
\$226.65/100

and every other member of the Association is taxed at a corresponding rate. The salaries of the persons holding offices in the executive and judiciary are to be paid from the funds so raised, and the excess if any will be laid out under the direction of the proper officers, in defraying the expence of building court houses, jails, and other necessary offices.

¹³ Charles Forrest, superintendent of the Cowlitz farm, Michael T. Simmons of Newmarket, John R. Jackson.

¹⁴ This was the extent of each American claim as allowed to each settler by the land laws of 1844 and 1845, passed by the provisional legislature—title to be perfected after five years' occupancy.

¹⁵ The former near the present Cowlitz, Washington, the other near the present Steilacoom, at the south end of Puget Sound.

¹⁶ Puget Sound Agricultural Company.

I may further inform your Honors that the Association does not pretend to exercise authority over such persons as have not voluntarily joined it, and do not contribute to its support, except in cases where injury is done to members of the Association, when reparation is exacted; neither does it extend protection to any but its own members. Any person, therefore, whether English or American, may become a member, or remain unconnected, as they may choose; but the benefits of the Association are so apparent to all that a very few of the Americans, and those, generally speaking, of the very worst character, have refused to join it.

The conduct of Mr. Applegate and his friends in promoting the Union, exposed him to the suspicions of the ultra-American party, and I am convinced that it was only their anxiety to prevent disorders in the country, that induced them to support the measure so strenuously. In fact, they were encouraged in their course by most of the respectable Americans in the Settlement, who, seeing the difficulty of preserving peace and preventing contentions about land claims, applied their attention to remodelling the former organic law, and divesting it entirely of its national character, in order to induce the Hudson's Bay Company's servants to enter the association. Having with these views made advances toward a union with us, we would not have felt justified even on the score of humanity, in refusing to act unitedly with them, as by doing so we relieved them from the apprehension of danger; gave them a right to coerce American citizens, and drive them from the Company's grounds by the action of the law.

20. At the same time, we have secured the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company, without embroiling ourselves or the British Government in vexatious disputes with a gang of low, contemptible vagabonds, who would feel highly honoured by such notice.

21. The Ultra party were excessively annoyed at this being called Vancouver's District, a point we insisted on carrying; it appeared to them a concession of American rights, and an avowal of the British claim to the north bank of the Columbia, but the tide set so strongly against them that their opposition was overpowered.

22. By this arrangement we have, in my opinion, greatly strengthened our position, and removed the immediate danger of collision without the concession of any British rights or objects or making any unworthy concession whatever; we have entered the Association avowedly as British subjects, which will certainly not weaken our influence in the country. Many, I know, will feel disposed to condemn the measure without understanding or inquiring into its merits; but I am happy to state that the officers of Her Majesty's Government, who have since visited this river, seem to think favourably of it, and I trust it will also meet the approbation of Your Honors. I think it would be folly in us to risk our property in supporting a false position, which can advance neither the interests of our country nor of the Hudson's Bay Company.

23. . . . [The Committee in London criticize the quality of the land beaver received from the Russian American Fur Company, asserting that their instructions had not been sufficiently attended to, and that the beaver by contract was to have come up to the standard of the Mackenzie River beaver.]

24. [McLoughlin defends himself on the ground that the requirement that the beaver should come up to the Mackenzie River beaver

was not in the contract. The letter of instructions from the Committee to McLoughlin was copied and given by him to Mr. Manson, with particular instructions to be careful as to the quality of the beaver.]

25. [Criticism by the Company based on their mistaken notion that McLoughlin planned to raise wheat in California, by the work of the Company's servants, and send it to Sydney, Australia. McLoughlin explains that he was misunderstood; the demand for flour at Oahu was great, and if any was secured it was to be sent there as part of the California trade, but to meet the demands made for it from Sydney. He adds]: If it had not been for the great expense of importing flour from Europe, the serious injury it received on the voyage, and the absolute necessity of being independent of the Indians for provisions, I would never have encouraged farming in this country, but it was impossible to carry on the trade without it.

[McLoughlin quotes a sentence from Simpson's letter of December 8, 1835]: "The California trade should likewise be pushed, if it pays at all, it will afford a freight to our country vessels, and a filling-up freight in the article of tallow to the homeward ship of the season."

26. In the 10th par. Mr. Secretary Barclay¹⁷ writes: "The report on the trade of the Northwest Coast contained in your despatch to the Governor and Committee and to Sir George Simpson is upon the whole satisfactory. The advantages, however, which the Governor and Committee had hoped would be derived from placing the Columbia Department under the charge of one person have, I am sorry to state, not been realized. After maturely considering the results which have been obtained up to the present time, and looking forward to the probable circumstances of the future, they are decidedly of opinion that it is not advisable that the charge of so extensive a district should be confided to one individual, however experienced. They have therefore resolved that the country shall be divided into two or more districts, each to be represented by a commissioned officer. This resolution will be communicated to the Southern Council in the next general letter, together with instructions to the council to make such a division of the country and to appoint such officers as they may think fit. The Governor and Committee have also determined as a necessary consequence that the allowance of £500 per annum which was granted to you beyond your emoluments as a chief factor in consideration of the great extent and consequent responsibility of the charge committed to you, shall cease on the 31st May, 1845."

27. As I stated in the 18th par. of mine of 19th July last, "as to the £500 it is part of the conditions on which I renewed my agreement with the Hudson Bay Company through Sir George Simpson, and I beg to state that I would have renewed my agreement on no other terms, and that I should have charge of the Columbia Department; and I objected at the time to Sir George Simpson at the clause giving power to the Committee to place any commissioned officer on the retired list. His reply was, 'You need not be anxious about it. This will not be done to you.'¹⁸ However it is not my wish to remain in the Service if my conduct is disapproved of. But in justice to myself, I beg to request that your Honors will please state what act or acts of

¹⁷ A. Barclay, secretary of the Hudson's Bay Company.

¹⁸ The quotation marks are erratic. The first quotation evidently ends after "Columbia Department".

mine have induced them to withdraw the allowance of £500 per annum from me, as I think before proceeding to this, I ought in justice to have been informed of what I have done, so as to have an opportunity to vindicate myself if I could.

28. [Quoting]: "The unfortunate death of your son at Stikine¹⁹ in the spring of 1842 has, as was to be expected, been a source of great grief and affliction to you, and your mind has naturally been much occupied in considering the means by which the parties who committed the act which caused his death may be brought to trial, but while the Governor and Committee sympathize with you as a father, and feel deeply concerned that so disgraceful a transaction should have taken place at one of their Establishments, they cannot approve of the measure you have adopted of sending all the parties concerned to Canada, the way you have done.

"From the information they have received, this appears to have been both an irregular and injudicious proceeding, and they doubt much if the object aimed at will be attained; but as you have chosen your own course, and instructed your agent in Canada to institute legal proceedings in the courts there, the Governor and Committee decline any interference on the part of the Company, and consider you responsible for all costs and consequences that may ensue."

29. I am obliged to your Honors for your kind sympathy for the murder of my late son, and if due pains had been taken to examine into that atrocious deed at first, by Sir George Simpson, it would not have been my painful duty to trouble you so much as I have done, and it was sufficiently mortifying to my feelings having Philip Smith rewarded by Sir George Simpson by an increase of wages, without having the additional outrage inflicted upon my feelings by seeing Charles Boulanger, one of the Stikene men implicated in the murder of my late son, sent this season back to the Department, and I am informed others of the men implicated in the Stikene murder are in the Company's service. The man Philip Smith is a common laborer, who had been left by Sir George Simpson as a temporary assistant to my late son, and though he saw Heroux load a gun with which he told Smith he intended to shoot my son, yet Smith never told my son of his danger, and though Smith declared this to Sir George Simpson in his deposition, instead of reprimanding him and taking measures to dismiss the man from the service as soon as possible, Sir George Simpson rewarded him by allowing him an increase of wages for the year he had yet to serve, and ordered him to be re-engaged at the increased rate for two years commencing from the expiration of his existing agreement, which I merely mention as a duty, so as to be clear of the consequences which must result from such proceedings.

30. As to having "chosen my own course" I only instructed my agent to prosecute if the Hudson's Bay Company did not do so, and as Sir George Simpson told him you would not prosecute the murderer of my late son, I had no other alternative but to act as I did, after the manner Sir George Simpson took the depositions, stating everything the deponent was pleased to say, without taking the trouble to ascertain

¹⁹ Young McLoughlin was murdered April 20, 1842, by a Canadian named Urbain Heroux. Fort Stikeen was near the mouth of the Stikeen River, near the present site of Wrangell, Alaska. See the account in Simpson's *Overland Journey*.

if it was true or not, acting upon it as if it were true, (we now know that what was *true* was grossly exaggerated, that the greater part is false, and that Philip Smith deliberately perjured himself) and founding his opinions on the depositions he took. Sir George Simpson sanctioned with the authority of his name calumnies against the memory of a man who was murdered merely because he obeyed the instructions he received from *him* (and which were proper) from which calumnies his memory could be relieved and justice done to all parties only by bringing the affair to a judicial investigation, and as an act of justice I must say though Sir George Simpson is accountable for the manner he took the depositions, yet if Mr. Rowand²⁰ had done his duty and mentioned to Sir George Simpson as he did here, that he considered my late son's life in danger from the bad disposition of the men at Stikine, my son would not have been murdered. And Sir George Simpson cannot forget that I repeatedly mentioned to him the danger to which Mr. Rowand often told me my son was exposed.

31. Sir George Simpson in his letter to your Honors, dated London, 5th Jany., 1843, writes, "I have learned from Mr. Rowand that his father and himself were informed by their servant La Grasse that the conduct of Mr. McLoughlin, Junior, was exceedingly violent and irregular, and that in an act of violence of then recent occurrence, a sword was broken."

To show your Honors how little pains Sir George Simpson takes to examine if what is reported to him be true, and how incorrect some of his informants are, I may mention that the sword alluded to was not broken in an act of violence on any person, but by accident; you see in Mr. Roderick Finlayson's deposition, who was with my late son from the day he took charge in March 1841 to the 2nd of October 1841 when Mr. [F.] and Dr. Rowand were at Stikene and left him, that the only punishment my deceased son inflicted during that time was that he chastised his servant once for stealing rum and getting drunk, Pierre Kanaquassé for stealing the provisions of the fort and giving them to Indians, and flogged two Sandwich Islanders for sleeping on their watch (as the security of the establishment depended on the vigilance of the sentinels); and even from the depositions taken from the men themselves, it is certain on their own showing they were not punished more severely than from their own confessions their misconduct deserved; and if my deceased son were alive to state what they had done, I am certain it would be found much less than ought to have been inflicted, and that there was not the least foundation for Sir George Simpson writing to me, in his letter of 27th April, 1842, "But I consider it due to the people to say that as a body their conduct throughout has been fully better than could have been expected under such inhuman treatment as they were frequently exposed to", and there can be no doubt in the minds of those acquainted with these men that from the manner La Grasse reported to them Mr. Rowand received the stories he told him, these men were induced to be more troublesome to my late son than they would otherwise have been, and that that may have led to his murder. Whatever may be the consequence of what I have done, I will have the satisfaction to feel that in acting as I did, I was only fulfilling

²⁰ Rowand, chief trader of the Saskatchewan district, had accompanied Simpson on his travels as far as Stikene, and for a time had been left there on account of illness.

my duty by doing what I could to see justice done, though I have not been able to accomplish it.

32. In the 12th par. of your despatch to Sir George Simpson, dated 10th March, 1845, you write, "We have perused with much attention the report contained in par. 9 to 43 inclusive of your despatch of 20th June last on the business on the west side of the mountains, which does not by any means appear to be in so prosperous or satisfactory a state as could be desired. This seems to arise from a variety of causes, but more especially from the very injurious and inconvenient proximity of emigrants from the United States, and from the presence of strange vessels on the Coast." I beg to submit that I consider it would have been but right and proper as an act of justice to us in this Department, and to the Company, in case of misapprehension, that Sir George Simpson had sent a copy of this report to me.

33. As to the mills mentioned in the 17th paragraph of that despatch and in the 38th and 39th par. of Sir George Simpson's of the 16th June last, I am surprised and pained after what I have written to see from the manner this is mentioned that my views and intentions have been misunderstood, and in justice to myself and family I beg to state I acted as I did in this affair to support the interests of the Hudson's Bay Company, and to fulfill more effectually the views in your instructions, than I could in any other manner possibly accomplish. In the 5th par. of yours of 28th August 1835 you write, "With respect to the Americans, we have no doubt that you have done that which appears right in regard to Wyeth²¹ and we hope it may prove so, but we are decidedly of the opinion that the very reverse of the system we recommend as applicable to the Russians should be pursued towards the Americans. Wherever they attempt to establish a post on shore we should have a party to oppose them, and to undersell them even at a loss." That is, as a general rule, the best way to contend with opponents in trade in the country.

34. As the "Falls of the Wallamette" are destined by nature to be the most important place in the country, and though there were improvements on it, yet the Methodist Mission wanted to possess themselves of the place, of which I was informed in 1840. But I could not believe that persons calling themselves Ministers of the Gospel would do what their countrymen in the most humble station in life having the least regard for right, would condemn. I did not therefore give credit to my informant, and you have seen by the documents I forwarded to you on the subject the very insidious manner they took to attain their object, and as they wanted by securing the place to increase their influence, so as to oppose me more effectually, to defeat them and secure the place it became necessary to build there, and though I might have built there in 1842 for the Hudson's Bay Company in compliance with Sir George Simpson's instructions in the 7th par. of his letter dated Woahoo,²² 1st March 1842, to whom in 1829 and in 1841 I had pointed out the importance of the place, yet as the Methodist Mission

²¹ Nathaniel J. Wyeth, coming out for the second time in 1834, had set up an establishment on Wapatoo Island, competing with the Company in the purchase of furs.

²² Oahu (Honolulu), Hawaiian Islands. The reader may compare Simpson's statement concerning the matter, in his letter of November 25, 1841, addressed to the Company from Fort Vancouver, *American Historical Review*, XIV. 82.

had excited a strong national policy against the Hudson's Bay Company without any cause whatever (as it is well known we never did them anything but good) and they acted thus as they said from national views, merely because we were a British Association maintaining and extending British influence, I was afraid if I built the mill in the name of the Hudson's Bay Company, it would be destroyed, from the feeling they had excited against us among their countrymen; and even if this did not occur, as you had written in your despatch of 21st July, 1824, "We cannot expect a more southern boundary of [than] the Columbia in any treaty with the Americans", when that occurs the Company would lose all its improvements at the place, which would become the property of the Methodist Mission and of Mr. Waller, without their paying one farthing for them, in the same way as one Beaubien dispossessed the United States of their barracks in Chicago, under the pre-emption laws of the United States,²³ and as there was no other way to avoid this loss, I conceived it necessary to follow out the plan and build there, but to build in my name. I did so, and wrote in my private letter to Sir George Simpson, dated 20th March, 1843, giving him a short detail of the proceedings of Mr. Waller and the Methodist Mission, and stating, "In acting as I have done, I have only been actuated by a desire to secure it more effectually to the concern, and to have less dispute about it, as I think it can be more effectually secured in the name of an individual than in that of the Company, and I wish to know:

"Can the Company secure the place in their own name?

"If they cannot, can I secure it for them in my name? If either of these can be done, I will do it at once. If the Company cannot keep it in their name, nor I keep it for them in mine, I will then keep it in my own name on my own account. In the meantime, till I hear from you, I will go on as if it was mine."

In his reply dated 21st June, 1843, he writes, "With respect to your private letter of 20th March on the subject of our claim to the Wallamette Falls, I submitted the same to Mr. Recorder Thom²⁴ for his opinion, which I beg to annex, and have handed both the letter and copy of opinion to the Governor and Committee." You see in this answer there is nothing explicit, nor is Mr. Recorder Thom more so; but if Sir George Simpson had authorized me to take possession of it in my name, I would not have given five acres land and five hundred dollars to the Rev. Mr. Waller, and if I had received your Honors decision in time (which I could at the same time I received copy of Mr. Thom's reply to my queries in regard to deserters, as I sent them by the same despatch in which I sent my queries to Sir George Simpson), I would have been able to give a test of proprietorship, and would not have had to give five thousand five hundred dollars to the Methodist Mission for the lots

²³ Jean Baptiste Beaubien, who since 1817 had lived on the Fort Dearborn reservation at Chicago, attempted in the thirties to acquire title to a part of it. In 1835 he entered a claim at the Chicago land-office, which was allowed. An action of ejectment against the United States agent was sustained by the state courts. The United States Supreme Court reversed the decision and ordered the land to be sold in lots to the highest bidder; but there was a general refusal to bid against Beaubien, and he bought in much of the property. Quaife, *Chicago and the Old Northwest*, p. 278; Andreas, *History of Chicago*, I. 84-86.

²⁴ Adam Thom, recorder of Rupert's Land, resident at Fort Garry (Winnipeg).

I had to purchase from them, as they had no just or legal claim, and I could have rejected them, and which I did because if it came to a legal decision, I could not produce a legal test of proprietorship and all the money laid out there would be lost and the building go to the Methodist Mission; and as all that had been done there was contrary to the instructions in yours of 21st July, 1824, I might be blamed, though in building there I did so to promote the interest of the Company in order to avert the loss. As I was situated I had no alternative but to act as I did, as the Methodist Mission was broken up and selling all their effects, and as these lots were required to complete the Establishment, if I allowed them to pass to the possession of others, I would not get them without paying much dearer for them.

35. If I had intended to speculate I would not have taken Abernethy's mill (for if any part breaks, the whole mill will become useless, as in this country there are no means of repairing it) when I had orders not to erect it, but which I did because it was a dead weight in the stores of the Company, and if not erected then (as Mr. Fenton, the millwright, at the time said and still says he would go home at the end of his engagement) the mill would have become a complete loss to the Company. To sum up the subject, I erected the mill to manage the business under my charge with more advantage to the Company, by enabling me to oppose our rivals in trade more effectually. Having acted with these motives and with these views in compliance with the spirit and tenor of your instructions and those of Sir George Simpson, I need not say how I must feel at the perusal of Mr. Secretary Barclay's despatch of 30th Nov. 1844, yours to Sir George Simpson of 11th March 1845, and Sir George Simpson to me of the 16th of June last. And so far am I from wishing to speculate, that as I consider (for reasons which I will state in a subsequent part of the despatch) that the Hudson's Bay Company will find it to their interest to carry on business there as long as the law allows them and as for this purpose the use of these premises will be highly advantageous to them, and as I intended them for that purpose, I will offer them to my successors at a rent sufficient to cover the wear and tear on the buildings, etc. with a right to sell them as soon as I find a purchaser. But it may be said, why not hold the claim in trust for the Company as others hold here? That can not be done, as I have given building lots on which the people have made improvements, and as the Company would lose the claim the moment it becomes U. S. Territory, these men would lose their property; to avert this, I can only make a sale of it to an individual.

36. In the 10th paragraph you say, "On delivery of her cargo at Fort Victoria, the engagement of the chartered vessel to the Company terminates, and she will be at the disposal of her Commander for the benefit of the owners, but is not again to be taken up for the Company's service, as there will be as many vessels in the country as can be advantageously employed". The transport by sea of this Department in consequence of the growing population and extension of our business in the country is increasing, and next year we will unavoidably have at least 6000 barrels flour to send to market, besides deals, spars, and salt salmon for the Sandwich Islands. We have besides a cargo of wheat to send to New Archangel,²⁵ a service (owing to the stormy

²⁵ Sitka.

climate) which will employ a vessel the greater part of the summer. We have also the transport to and from the posts in the Straits of De Fuca which will give full employment to the *Cadboro*,²⁶ and we have also to send the outfits and bring the returns of the posts on the N. W. Coast which will employ another vessel a great part of the season. We have the furs of the interior to be sent round to Victoria, and the outfit for this place to be brought here, and to despatch one vessel with the returns for England in November, after which we remain with one barque and the *Cadboro* (which is not to be depended on for a sea voyage in winter) until the next London ship arrives in 1847.

37. From this your Honors will see that this amount of work cannot be got through with the shipping means at our disposal, and besides what I have stated, the Russian American Company have just written to us to send them an additional cargo of wheat and flour, and we are likewise directed to send to Victoria 1000 barrels flour for the use of Her Majesty's ships which may call there; and instead of increasing our shipping as I requested in mine of 4th July, 1844, by sending a larger vessel to replace the schooner *Cadboro*, you have increased the labour in the Department by ordering the chartered vessel to leave the outfit for this place at Victoria, while you have diminished our means by directing us not to employ her; and I beg to state in justice to the business that you [we?] will find it necessary to authorize the officer at this place to get the outfit brought here by the chartered vessel after she has landed the outfit for the coast at Fort Victoria, and also to deliver her a cargo for Woahoo or Tahiti, all of which ought to be conditionally settled with the owners in England, and as you see by the 20th par. of mine of 19th July last we will have a large quantity of produce to send to Tahiti if Messrs. Pelly and Allen can secure the contract and get means to transport it; and as those prices will pay us, I write by the present opportunity to Messrs. Pelly and Allan if they can secure the contract to charter her (if they will consider she will answer the purpose and can get her on favorable terms) to take a cargo to Tahiti, trusting, as you see the necessity of the case, that it will meet with your approbation.

38. As to the application of the Russians for another cargo of wheat and flour, if I was in charge I would not send it, unless instructed, as I consider the Company lose money at the present price, say 10/9 per Tanega of 126 lbs. owing to the length of time the vessels take to make the voyage. The *Vancouver* left this on the 7th May for Sitka, and only arrived here on the 12th instant. But if the Russian would send here for the wheat that price would pay.

39. In the 18th paragraph,—“We notice what you say in the 19th paragraph of your despatch in regard to the trade in buying and selling carried on at Vancouver with settlers, for which it appears that credit is taken in the Columbia accounts for a sum of £6000 owing by them; you will have to draw the particular attention of Council to this subject, to adopt some improved mode of conducting our dealings with these people, as from the heavy amount of outstanding debts, it appears to us that the present system must be defective and objectionable, and we cannot too strongly impress upon you the advantage of confining the dealings with settlers to prompt payment transactions as the best means of guarding against loss and difficulties arising out of disputes in the adjustment

²⁶ The Company's schooner, of only 72 tons.

of accounts", and Sir George in the 41st par. of his of the 16th June last,—“the credit system of business has been carried on we think to a very imprudent extent”. I beg to observe as I have already reported, we have since 1840 had a strong opposition in the Methodist Mission, Capt. Couch came here also that year and returned in 1842, as also Capt. Chapman, and in 1843 Mr. Pettygrove.²⁷ Capt. Chapman went away the same year he came, and gave up the business; the Methodists are broken both as a Mission and as a store-keeper, but Mr. Abernethy has purchased their small remains, and with Couch and Pettygrove are our present competitors. This last spring the Methodists offered to sell me their debts amounting to twenty-seven thousand dollars, and Capt. Couch in August last, offered to sell me his, as he said, amounting to thirty thousand, which of course I would not purchase, but which I mention that you may know how we were situated and our returns show they got very few furs, as you can satisfy yourselves by the abstract of accounts forwarded with this, and as you know, in competition we must regulate our proceedings by those of our opponents, and I also followed in acting as I did the instructions in the 5th par. of your despatch of 28th August, 1835, [quoting]

“With respect to the Americans, we have no doubt that you have done that which appeared to you to be best with regard to Mr. Wyeth, and we hope it may prove so, but we are decidedly of the opinion that the very reverse of the system we recommend as applicable to the Russians should be pursued towards the Americans. Wherever they attempt to establish a post on shore, we should have a party to oppose them even at a loss. Wherever they have a ship on the coast, we should have one there to compete with them. The sacrifice in opposition, you must from experience have found, is the cheapest in the long run.” And you repeat the same in the 35th par. of yours of 15th August, 1843,—“You will in all probability have been visited by Capt. Couch the last summer as you expected. In cases of this kind, we can give you no particular directions for your conduct, as you must be governed by circumstances as they arise; the general principle to be acted upon when competition occurs is to endeavour to defeat the object of the intruder by every fair means within your power, rendering speculation unprofitable, and selling at a small or even no profit for the time. We have but a choice of evils in such cases, but this plan we are of opinion will prove the least disadvantageous in the long run.” This most certainly is in my opinion the only way to compete in this country with an opposition, and which I have always seen followed; and which I considered it advisable to follow in this case, so as to secure our hold on the farmers, especially as you wrote in the 13th par. of yours of 21st December, 1842,—“It is probable in a year or two hence the Russian American Company may require a further quantity of flour beyond what is already contracted for, for Kamschatka.” I therefore made advances to meet this expected demand, as it would be better if not required to send it to Ooahoo than not to be able to fulfil the contract; and in 1842 and 1843 a great number of American immigrants came to the country, many of whom were in a destitute condition, who had not wherewith to pay even canoe hire to Indians for bringing them from the Dalles to this place, and if I had not made them advances to enable them to do so, they would have got into quarrels with

²⁷ See Bancroft, *Oregon*, I. 245, 422.

the Indians, would have been murdered, our business would have suffered, and it would have been reported throughout the world that we had set the Indians to murder these poor people, and time only could have cleared us of this odious imputation; meanwhile this defamatory report would most assuredly have injured the Company. But even if these immigrants had not been murdered by the Indians, and in that consequence of our refusing them assistance, some of them had perished (as I believe would have been the case, and which all the Americans admit), such an outcry would justly have been raised against us here, that even you in London would have suffered by it, and be blamed for the inhuman conduct of those persons managing the business of which you had the supreme direction, and I believe you would have been among the first to censure my conduct, and in acting as I have done I firmly believe that time will prove I have not only fulfilled the dictates of humanity, but most effectually promoted the best interests of the Company, as after all these men are paying their debts (charged with interest at 6 per cent) and the whole amount will be considerably reduced this year, and though we may and *will* lose some, still on the whole we will draw in a sufficient sum to pay us and leave us a handsome profit on the whole amount, for I must do the Americans the justice to say that as a body they are most anxious to pay their debts, and though there are among them a few bad characters, as is the case in all large communities, still as a body it is certain they will support what is right, and their hostility towards us, though it was very great, as through ignorance of *ours*, they thought we were infringing *their* national rights, as stated in the speeches of Messrs. Lynn, Benton, and Buchanan, and in the pamphlet of Messrs. Slacum, Kelly, and Spaulding,²⁸ in which we are represented to have caused between four and five hundred American citizens to be murdered; and so firmly did these men believe we had acted as represented, that they thought when they left the United States they would have to build forts to defend themselves from us and the Indians whom we would set on them; and certainly no person can blame them for feeling as they did, after hearing such false reports concerning us, but now that they are correctly informed, I am happy to find that these prejudices are disappearing fast.

40. . . . [Condemnation of McLoughlin's judgment in buying cattle from a Mr. Lease, driven up from California, which he offered to take on his own account if the Company refused to accept his judgment on the purchase. Simpson had written, as quoted by McLoughlin], "And we wish it distinctly understood that such transactions as are out of the ordinary course of business will not, unless entered on by special authority, be sanctioned hereafter." . . . [McLoughlin's reason for the purchase was because trade opposition in beef had brought the price to 3d. per pound, which did not more than cover cost and charges of the cattle; also to prevent American speculation in cattle. He sold

²⁸ Probably Senator Linn's speech of August 12, 1841, or of January 26 or January 30, 1843, Benton's of August 20, 1842, Buchanan's of August 20, 1842. Slacum's pamphlet is the *Memorial of William A. Slacum*, 25 Cong., 2 sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 24*, reprinted in 25 Cong., 3 sess., *House Report No. 101*, Appendix N, and in the *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society, XIII. 177-224; Kelley's, his *Memoir* of January 31, 1839, in 25 Cong., 3 sess., *House Report No. 101*, Appendix O; and that of Captain Spaulding of the *Lausanne*, in 27 Cong., 2 sess., *House Report No. 830*, appendix.

them to the opponents of the cattle company, making nothing by the sale, but protecting the Company's trade. The explanation is a very lengthy one.]

41-42. . . . [McLoughlin complains that in answer to his request that Sir George Simpson would cite specific cases of injustice and severity to the men, he merely replies]: "Dr. McLoughlin wishes me to cite instances of that system of violence which has so often been noticed as prevailing on the west side of the mountains. I must, however, decline doing so, chiefly through an unwillingness to prolong so unprofitable a discussion of what is past, but if the journals of the different posts have been kept as carefully as they ought to have been, they will of themselves, I am sure, indicate a state of discipline decidedly different from anything practiced in any other quarter of the country. Such I take to be the undeniable fact and though perhaps most of the individual cases may be palliated or justified, yet I cannot too strongly impress on every gentleman's mind the tendency of habitual severity to render the service unpopular."

[McLoughlin refers to and quotes from a letter of March 20, 1844, which the editor of these documents has seen in the Company's archives, and to which Simpson replied, June 16, 1844]: "You express surprise to learn that the men who have left the Columbia complain of ill-usage, and seem to regret that individual cases were not cited. I have only to say the complaints of late have been so universal that it would occupy more time and attention than I am able to bestow on the subject to enter into details."

[Having quoted his own letter, and Simpson's reply, (both with great repetition), McLoughlin continues]: I can only say that Sir George Simpson having brought forward charges against us for ill-treating the men in the Company's service, and on having been called on for proofs, produces none, I must therefore consider that he has brought forward these charges without having any foundation for so doing. And in justice to myself I must say as a proof that the men are not ill-used at Vancouver; when Sir George Simpson was here in 1841, not one man complained to him of ill-usage. We have at times here as many as 200 men, and though they have daily opportunities of deserting to the Wallamette Settlement, yet only one man has deserted from this place since I have been here, (now twenty years), though they were encouraged to do so by persons inimical to us, and had the great inducement held out to them of becoming entitled to a claim of 640 acres of land,—and this man deserted two years ago. A short time after his desertion, I went to the Wallamette, and on sending a message to him, he came to me and delivered himself up. But some months afterwards he deserted a second time, and as he is a bad character, and occasionally feigns fits of insanity (it was while feigning one of these fits that he deserted the first time), and in his pretended fits he gave us a good deal of trouble, I allowed him to remain. As to the men who deserted from the brigade, they came here direct, and most certainly would not have done so if we had been in the habit of treating our men in the manner Sir George Simpson states.

43. [Delay of the *Cowlitz* at the mouth of the Cowlitz River, receiving wheat on an unexpected call for that commodity from the Russians.]

44. [Difficulty between Mr. Dodd²⁹ and a servant whose manner was insulting, when two or three others were "impudently looking on". Dodd gave the man a thrashing, to save the situation in the eyes of the Indians.] It was necessary for him to act as he did, as if he had not he would not only have lost the command of his men, but this would have got to the knowledge of the Indians, and would have endangered the safety of the establishment, and it may seem strange, but still it is a fact, that nothing tends more to the security of establishments at such a place as Stikene than that the Indians should know that the officer in charge is a man who will not allow himself to be imposed on.

45. . . . [McLoughlin's defense of his action in raising the salary of Angus McDonald (B)³⁰ ranking as postmaster, to £75 for present year and next (1845 and 1846), and £100 for 1847.]

46. In his [Simpson's] 35th paragraph, [quoting], "Our operations on the West side of the mountains, although very extended and showing according to the accounts transmitted fair profits, we think are not so productive as represented by the accounts. According to the statements from the Columbia the profits are on

Outfit 1841	£22974
" 1842	16982
" 1843	21726

whereas by a statement herewith forwarded, you will observe the profits are reduced, on

Outfit 1841 actual profit	£1474
" 1842 actual loss	4003
" 1843 actual loss	3136

This very startling discrepancy seems principally to arise from the Columbia account of returns being valued 25 per cent above their value."

The returns were valued at those prices in compliance with the instructions received from the Governor and Council. I also received a document, of which the following is a copy,—

"California Balance Sheet, Outfit 1842.	
"By profit, per Columbia statement	£2363. 3.7
"Less overcharge on hides,	£1222. 0.2
" " beaver	116. 7.6
" " otters	205. 4.0
" " wheat	496. 0.8
" credited Sandwich Islands, ³¹	
on 5000 [?] supplied California	132.16.1
4c. each	93. 6.8
" 12 months interest on	
inventory	219.18.0
	£2485.13.1
" Apparent loss	£ 122. 9.6"

²⁹ Dodd, chief mate of the *Cowlitz*, had been left by Simpson in charge at Stikeen after young McLoughlin's murder.

³⁰ There seem to have been two of this name, one designated as (A) and the other as (B).

³¹ This seems to refer to some temporary loan, or use of \$5000, permitted to the California post from the Sandwich Islands; but it is not clear.

But no details are sent to show how they came to these results. But how they worked out the loss of 4c. on every dollar supplied by Woahoo to California is quite unaccountable, as the latter is charged 5/ sterling per dollar, and Woahoo got credit for that sum, while when it remits in bills Woahoo never got so much. But that is not the way to examine the affair so far as my management is concerned, but to take my instructions and examine my proceedings, and the more it is done by persons acquainted with the business of the place, the more I believe I have cause to be satisfied; and it is, I beg to say impossible for any person to get acquainted with the business unless he is a year at the very least at the place and attends to the whole transactions, and sees how the different branches bear on each other.

48. [Paragraph regarding the desirability of having Father De Smet order goods necessary for his missions through the Company in England, to be sent in their ships, rather than buy from Fort Vancouver, as the bills had to be paid in Europe.]

49. In the 40th paragraph of his despatch, 16th June,—[quoting] “Now that the mills are disposed of, we consider it highly desirable to withdraw the Company’s officers and servants from the Wallamette Falls, as we do not think the prospects of trade are sufficiently encouraging to render it an object for the Company to keep up an establishment there. You will therefore be pleased to withdraw C. F. Ermatinger and any other servant or officers belonging to the Company from that place, stationing Mr. Ermatinger at Colville for the winter, as directed by the Council and noticed in a former part of this despatch, unless indeed it be found that you can conveniently dispense with that gentleman’s services altogether for the season in which case he is to be at liberty to proceed to England by the ship.”

“Inconvenience and perhaps in some instances loss might arise if the Company had no person at the Falls to watch their interest, we therefore think instead of maintaining an expensive establishment as heretofore, it might be advisable to supply Mr. J. G. Campbell, or some other active, intelligent American resident there with a few goods to enable him to trade skins brought thither by Indians and others, and generally to attend to the Company’s affairs, allowing him a certain sum for his services in such agency, such allowance to cover all charges for labour, maintenance, residence, etc., etc. By these arrangements the deeply rooted existing jealousy towards the Company arising at the Falls [will be] removed, while the little business we conduct there will be carried on upon an economical policy.

“41.” [Still quoting]: “An anxious desire to concentrate the very unpromising and unproductive business in which we are at present engaged in the same quarter would determine us on withdrawing the post at Campment du Sable,³² were it not that a store or granary there seems necessary at present to collect, in grains, some portion of the very heavy outstanding debts in the Wallamette. The credit system of business with the settlers has been carried on we think to a very imprudent extent, and as there is neither honor nor honesty among those people, and that as British subjects we cannot enforce the recovery of debts under the existing laws, we are of opinion that it might be good

³² A sandy bluff on the east side of the Willamette, at or near the present Butteville; an entrance to the French Prairie. The store built by the Company at Butteville about 1840 remained standing until 1890.

policy to sell these debts to any respectable American who would be disposed to purchase them in a block at such a discount as would enable him to make something by them. We do not however press the mode of closing these transactions, but throw out the suggestions for your consideration and adoption if you think it advisable. Should you determine on continuing the establishment at Campment du Sable, we have to beg that it be kept up on a very moderate scale, say a keen, intelligent clerk or postmaster,³³ and one man to be provided with a few goods for sale on prompt payment, and for the purpose of collecting any furs that might come within their reach. In order to guard against national jealousy, it might perhaps be found to answer better to employ an American, say Newell,³⁴ to collect the outstanding debts. Indeed we are disposed to believe that an active American would be much more successful in collecting these debts both from the Company's retired servants and from Americans than any of our own people that could be employed there.

"42" [of Simpson]. "C. F.³⁵ McLoughlin in one of his letters seems to think the Wallamette settlers will have about 50,000 bus. grain for market this year; we do not however think that a trade in that article beyond what may be required for the Service, for the Russian American Company, and for a depot of about 1000 barrels flour to be kept on hand from year to year to meet the demands of any of Her Majesty's vessels that may visit the coast, is an object deserving our attention. The produce of the Company's farm at Vancouver, (the crop of which last year C. F. McLoughlin estimates at 4,000 bu. wheat, etc.) and those at the Cowlitz and Fort Victoria together with the grain which we have every reason to expect in payment of our debt from the Wallamette settlers, we think ought to meet all these demands, and considering the state of our present relations with the United States and the troublesome population by whom we are surrounded we are indisposed to embark more largely in that branch of trade than these demands appear to render necessary."

[50?] I have troubled you with these extracts as they are completely at variance with the instructions I received from the Governor and Council which hitherto have been in unison with the 5th par. of yours of 25th August, 1835, and the 33d par. of 27th Sept. 1843, and which have always been the rule of my conduct as will be found to be the case when it is properly understood, and though it is probable that the boundary will soon be settled, yet as it is certain that the Hudson's Bay Company can obtain all the time and every facility to draw in their debts, and as most certainly they will find it to their interest to keep a store at Oregon City, I would recommend them to do so as long as the law allows them, managed by their own officers.

51. Oregon City is destined by nature to be the best place for commerce in this country, and is about twenty-five miles from this place; and people will prefer to pay dearer there than to come here. The Company this year will sell goods there to the amount of £4000 sterling, on which they will gain something handsome, though at present (as

³³ A postmaster ranked between a laborer and a clerk.

³⁴ Robert Newell, a member of the legislative assembly from Champoege County. See *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society, IX. 103-126, article by T. C. Elliott.

³⁵ C. F. for Chief Factor.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXI.—9.

the season for making out the accounts is not yet come) we cannot say what the amount may be; besides this, by so doing, they keep their competitors occupied, and prevent them extending their trade to other posts, and maintain and extend their own influence. It was because I thought Great Britain would have the north bank of the Columbia, that to facilitate the farmers in bringing their produce to this place, I took the precaution to obtain a right to erect a canal there, which can be constructed at a very small expense.

52. In the 76th Resolve of Council, it is directed "that settlers and missionaries of all denominations be charged 100% on prime cost for cash on approved bills, dollars being valued at 4/6 each." I beg to observe that having opposition to contend with it will be impossible to adhere to this resolve and that it will be entirely necessary to regulate the prices by those of their competitors, and the demand of the article.

53. Having detained you so much on these subjects to which I have referred in the foregoing part of my despatch to explain to you my motives for acting in every manner as I have, and in justice to myself I beg to request that you will oblige me by informing me what act of mine has caused you to decide, as Mr. Secretary Barclay writes me in the 10th par. of his despatch of 30th November, 1844,—

"The advantages however which the Governor and Committee had hoped would be derived from placing the Columbia Department under the charge of one person I am sorry to state have not been realized"; and as to the following extract, in a subsequent part of the same paragraph,—“After maturely considering the results that have been obtained up to the present time, and looking forward to the probable circumstances of the future, they are decidedly of opinion that it is not advisable that the charge of so extensive a district should be confided to one individual however experienced; and they have therefore decided that the country shall be divided into two or more districts, each to be represented by a commissioned officer.” Sir George Simpson will recollect that I would renew my agreement on no other terms but that I would have charge of the Columbia District and £500 per annum beyond my emolument as a chief factor. As to the altered circumstances of the Department, they cannot I consider apply to the case, as at the time of my agreeing, I asked Sir George Simpson if the joint stock company did not take place,³⁶ whether I would be allowed the five hundred pounds per annum extra emolument. His reply was that I would still have the five hundred.

54. As to the leave of absence granted me in the 44th paragraph of Sir George Simpson's despatch of 16th June last, in justice to my own character, I cannot think of availing myself of it, as I consider my services necessary to the close of the outfit, so as to carry out the plans I laid down for the operation of the outfit, and the result will show if the measures I adopted and followed were judicious or not, and if I have exerted myself with zeal to promote the interests of the Company,—and I certainly if possible will go out next spring,³⁷ not to take a charge there as that is out of the question, but merely to demand as a right a full examination into my conduct and proceedings in the man-

³⁶ Probably the Puget Sound Agricultural Association, which was joint-stock company, and was organized the winter McLoughlin was in London, 1838–1839, at which time he renewed his agreement.

³⁷ That is, go out with the overland express, thence to London.

agement of my charge, which is no less an act of justice to myself than to the Company. For if my measures were proper and are now not only not pursued but even censured, I am wronged and the Company injured. But as this proceeds from relying on incorrect information or misrepresentation, I trust that when the truth is known that justice will be done me.

55. A much larger immigration came from the States this year than formerly, but I cannot say the exact number, some say three, others five thousand. They brought large herds of cattle, and judging from their appearances, they seem with few exceptions to have been in easy circumstances in their own country.

56. [Departure of the *Vancouver* to N. W. coast and return.]

57. [Derangement of shipping business through the long delay of the *Vancouver*.]

58. [*Vancouver* to go with flour to Oahu,] touching at St. Francisco to land an officer to close the California business, and on her return will again touch at St. Francisco to bring the officer and the proceeds of the business to this place.

59. [Short note on the voyage of the *Cowlitz*.]

60. [Good general sales at the Oahu store.]

61. [Receipt from Consul General Millar of answer to McLoughlin's letter of 24th March, 1845; very general. This letter was regarding protection needed at Fort Vancouver against the threats of outlaw settlers to burn it down.]

62. [Regarding letter written to Pelly and Allan, agents at Oahu, referring to McLoughlin's letter to Millar.]

63. [Pelly and Allan forward to Millar an extract from McLoughlin's letter to them.]

64. [Arrival of John Work³⁸ from the coast, where all was quiet.]

65. [Captain McNeill³⁹ obliged to return to Stikine in a Russian vessel, from a nearby point, as Captain Humphreys, of the Company's ship,⁴⁰ refused him passage.]

66. [McLoughlin and McNeill declare Captain Humphreys to be obviously mentally unbalanced.]

67. . . . [Announces arrival of Lieutenant Peel, with Captain Parke of the Marines, with a letter from Captain Gordon of the *America*, which had just arrived in the Straits from the Sandwich Islands, to investigate Oregon conditions and report to England.] "When Lieutenant Peel⁴¹ arrived, Chief Factor Douglas was on a tour in the Wallamette with Captain Warre and Lieutenant Vavasour, and were (as was well known would be the case) received by all the settlers in the Wallamette with the utmost hospitality of which their means would

³⁸ One of the Company's chief factors.

³⁹ William McNeill, an American, who, after skillful opposition to the Company, had been called into its service and was now captain of the Company's steamer *Beaver*.

⁴⁰ The *Columbia*.

⁴¹ Third son of Sir Robert Peel. Captain John Gordon, R. N., was a brother of the Earl of Aberdeen. For the visit of Warre and Vavasour, see the *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society, X. 1-99. A copy of their report, unfavorable to McLoughlin, was sent by Governor Simpson to Douglas, and shown by the latter to McLoughlin in 1846, after his retirement. Bancroft summarizes it, *Oregon*, I. 501-504.

admit, for although these men are rough in their manners, their hospitality and kindness to strangers are proverbial. Lieutenant Peel and Captain Parke accompanied by Mr. Lowe (one of our officers whom I sent for the purpose) visited the Wallamette, and they also appeared well pleased with the reception they received.

68. On the 16th September Mr. Douglas accompanied by Lieutenant Peel and Captain Parke left this [place] to proceed to the *America*. I wrote Captain Gordon (No. 15) and Mr. Douglas went to the *America* to give any further information Captain Gordon might require for Her Majesty's Government. Chief Factor Douglas found the *America* at Port Discovery, remained on board three days with the Hon. Capt. Gordon, and handed him a copy of my correspondence with the Methodist Mission about the Falls and of my report to you on Messrs. Slacum's and Kelly's narrative, and Dr. Lynn's speeches.⁴² As these narratives and speeches are circulated in the Pacific, I considered it but proper that British officers should be informed of this gross misrepresentation.

69. . . . [Douglas went from the *America* to Victoria, where work in the construction of the fort was going on under Roderick Finlayson; he returned to Vancouver October 16.] But on his way back he found the *Modeste*, Captain Baillie, anchored in New Dungeness, who handed him a letter from Admiral Seymour to me (No. 16) and addressed one (No. 17) to Chief Factor Douglas to which the latter replied (No. 18), and on learning that the *Modeste* was in the Columbia River, we immediately sent them refreshments.⁴³ I wrote him (No. 19) in which you will see I coincide with Chief Factor Douglas and recommend that the *Modeste* come to this place, for although all the people are very quiet and I do not apprehend the least danger, still the visit of a British man-of-war to the place has both a moral and political effect and shows that our Government is ready to protect us.⁴⁴ But before receiving my letter, Capt'n Baillie wrote me one (No. 20) and on the receipt of mine he wrote his answer (No. 21) and of course is now on his way here, and I expect to see him with the first westerly wind. We will treat him and his officers with that attention and cordiality to which the flag under which they serve and the service they render us entitle them.

70. The farmers have large crops but unfortunately lost some by rain during harvest, which is the first instance of the kind while I am here. We have in store at this place, at the Falls, and at Campment du Sable about 50,000 bushels wheat, besides what is at the Cowlitz;

⁴² Slacum, Kelley, Linn. See note 28, above.

⁴³ While Douglas came overland to Vancouver by the Cowlitz trail, from Puget Sound, the *Modeste* sailed down the coast and into the Columbia River.

⁴⁴ A great deal was made by the American settlers in Oregon and by American politicians at Washington, D. C., of this visit of the *Modeste*, and Miss Agnes Laut (*Conquest of the Great Northwest*, II. 367) goes so far as to refer to the five hundred marines on board as keeping the Americans quiet. The muster-roll consulted in the British Public Record Office shows that the *Modeste* had on board fifteen officers, eighteen marines, thirteen boys, and a crew of 115 sailors. She ranked as third-class, having only twelve or fourteen guns. On account of the lawless element among the settlers and their persistent threats against Fort Vancouver, the *Modeste* stayed in the river a year and a half. The letters, referred to by number, related to the need of the fort for protection.

between the Puget Sound Farm and the settlers at that place, say about 10,000. The crop at Vancouver is about 4000 bushels wheat, 4000 pease and about 5000 oats. And as I stated in par. 36, after supplying the contract for the Russians, we will have 5000 barrels flour for sale, but we will have some difficulty in getting barrels to contain the flour. At present we purchase wheat at 60 cents per bushel, payable in goods at 100 per cent advance, but only from a few good customers whom out of policy we cannot cast off.

71. [Regarding a note to Chief Factor Peter Skeen Ogden, from both McLoughlin and Douglas, asking his opinion as to their action in joining the Provisional Government; no answer as yet from Ogden, who was in the interior.]

72. . . . [Dugald McTavish to proceed in the *Vancouver* to San Francisco, to close the California business]: as it has been out of my power to send a person there since I heard of the death of Mr. Rae.

73. In closing this my official correspondence with Your Honors, I beg to observe that I always thought that exerting myself zealously to promote the interests of the Hudson's Bay Company, to the best of my abilities, would at least assure me their approbation, if not their protection. Whether I have done the best the circumstances of the case would admit is not for me to determine; but I will assert that I went so far in my zeal as to risk my private means to carry on works at the Wallamette Falls so as to secure it from persons who wanted to get it in order to use the influence the place would give to the prejudice of the Hudson's Bay Company, to which I was also induced on account of the hostile feeling the immigrants had to the Company, as I was afraid if I did [not] give them employment, that animated with this feeling and urged by their wants, they might make an attack on the property at this place which might be destroyed, and for which the Hudson's Bay Company never could get any indemnification, and the whole of the Company's business in this Department would be ruined. In doing which, by Sir George Simpson's not writing me in 1843, to take the place in my own name, I had to give five acres of the best ground for building lots, and five hundred dollars to Rev. Mr. Waller,⁴⁵ and by the Hudson's Bay Company not giving me sanction to take it in my own name⁴⁶ in time (which they could readily have done) I had to pay three thousand four hundred and twenty dollars for improvements not worth one-half the money and one thousand nine hundred and eighty dollars for lots to which they had no claim,—and to close the business, it is proposed this year to charge me an advance of 100 per cent on the goods I have had to carry on the business,⁴⁷ when I carried it on with the spirit of opposition and made it subservient to the Hudson's Bay Company business and interests, and so little is what I have done understood, or more properly speaking, it is so completely mis-

⁴⁵ Rev. Alvan F. Waller, Methodist missionary. For his controversy with the writer, see Holman, *Dr. John McLoughlin*, pp. 105–109 *et seq.*

⁴⁶ Under his contract with the Company, McLoughlin could not engage in any business, or give attention to any personal interest. The entire time and thought of the officers and servants, by contract, were to be given to the Company.

⁴⁷ One of the first actions of James Douglas, in taking charge of Fort Vancouver, was to settle this on a more just basis, as reported by him in a very matter-of-fact way.

understood, that instead of being appreciated as it ought, I am disgraced, and my salary of £500 per annum, which is a part of the consideration on which I renewed my agreement, is stopped without any previous notice as I only heard it on the 15th June last. But my conduct must have been misrepresented, or I must have been completely misunderstood, and I trust that when the truth is known, it will be found that I have acted with as much zeal as if my life had been at stake, and justice will be done me.

74. If business admitted, I would certainly go to London with the present opportunity, as I feel my presence would be necessary not only on my own account, but that of the Company, and allow me to assure you that I find it necessary for the well being of the business that an officer well acquainted with it should go to London to give you explanations every second year. If this had been the case, most certainly the business of this Department would have benefitted by it, and I would not suffer as I do.

75. Referring you to the accompanying documents for further information on the business of the department, and though I am treated in a very different manner to what I expected, and very far from what I consider myself entitled to, with best wishes for the prosperity of the trade and full confidence that time will prove if I have done my best to promote it or not,

I have the honor to remain,

Your most obedient, humble servant

JOHN McLoughlin

Chief Factor

To

The Governor, Deputy Governor, and Committee,
Hon'ble Hudson's Bay Company
London

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Ancient Hunters and their Modern Representatives. By W. J.

SOLLAS, D.Sc., F.R.S., Professor of Geology and Palaeontology in the University of Oxford. Second edition. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1915. Pp. xxiii, 591, 2 plates and 314 text illustrations.)

THE first edition of this work appeared in 1911. The author has made good use of the intervening four years, as is seen by a comparison of the two. The number and titles (with a single slight exception) of the chapters remain the same; but there are 182 more pages and 80 more illustrations. The new matter is largely due to the consideration of new discoveries such as: "Eoanthropus", Commont's researches in the Somme valley, the caverns of Castillo, Tuc d'Audoubert, etc.

The plan, and this has not been changed, is perfectly expressed in the title: a comparison of the hunters of the past with those of the present. The most ancient hunters are contrasted with the recently extinct Tasmanians, the Mousterians with the living Australian aborigines, the Aurignacians with the Bushmen, and the Magdalenians with the Eskimo. The comparisons are often carried so far however as to obscure the real merits of the work in the field of pre-history.

In the revision a serious error has been eliminated, in that the wonderful palaeolithic mural frescoes are given their rightful place in the Magdalenian epoch instead of the Aurignacian. In the first edition the race of Cro-Magnon was described as of the Magdalenian age; in the second it is transferred to the Aurignacian epoch. The use of the term *boucher* to replace *coup de poing*, the name given by G. de Mortillet to the type implement of the Chellean and Acheulian series, is retained in the new edition. The new name is in honor of Boucher de Perthes, to whom belongs the chief credit in establishing the authenticity of river-drift implements. While it has not found favor with French archaeologists, such terms as volt, joule, and watt, from the nomenclature of physicists, furnish ample precedents for the adoption of *boucher*.

The industrial evolution of the last three phases that are distinctly palaeolithic is well outlined, including the appearance of new types of stone implements and the use of materials other than stone, such for example as bone, ivory, and the horn of stag and reindeer. The once problematical *bâton de commandement* is believed to be nothing more nor less than a straightener for the shafts of arrows and javelins, as originally suggested by Boyd Dawkins.

In his discussion of "*Eoanthropus dawsoni*" recently discovered in a gravel pit at Piltdown Common, Sussex, England, the author accepts the views of Dr. A. Smith Woodward and Professor G. Elliott Smith. This briefly is that the skull and lower jaw belong to one and the same individual; that while the skull is "truly human", the lower jaw is "as distinctly simian". Hence the differences between the man of Piltdown and *Homo* are generic, and Dr. Woodward was justified in his use of the name *Eoanthropus*. The canine tooth subsequently found by Father P. Teilhard, Sollas again agrees with Woodward in assigning to the lower jaw, right side (some authorities would place this tooth in the upper jaw instead).

The closing chapters treat of the transition from the palaeolithic to the neolithic age, represented by the so-called Azilian culture, and the question of chronology. The author is "increasingly impressed by the conflicting nature of the evidence" bearing on chronology, and frankly confesses that his conclusions are "largely provisional, open to question, and certain to be modified with the progress of discovery".

His conclusions are that the Chellean age may be referred to the last interglacial epoch. The Acheulian, together with the warm Mousterian, might have commenced as this epoch was drawing to a close, but outlasted it and did not terminate till the last glaciation was well advanced. The cold Mousterian corresponded perhaps to the maximum of the last glacial epoch; the Aurignacian, Solutréan, and Magdalenian to the period of retreat; while the Azilian ushered in the present era. This is in harmony with the views of Boule, Breuil, Obermaier, and Schmidt. It differs radically from those of Penck and James Geikie, and partially from those of Commont, who believes that the early Chellean or pre-Chellean belongs to the preceding interglacial epoch, the Mindel-Riss.

In his attempt to assign dates to the palaeolithic epochs the author is ultra-conservative, even granting that the Chellean does not antedate the last interglacial epoch. His standard of time measurement is based on Baron de Geer's count of the number of layers of sediment which the melting ice deposited in the sea during its retreat across Scandinavia; each layer is supposed to represent the melting of a single summer. In brief, Sollas estimates that the Chellean epoch closed only about 27,000 years ago. This is approximately half the time allowed by Obermaier, who freely admits that his own estimate is much more likely to be below the mark than above it.

The author has not suppressed his personal opinions on controverted questions. Granting that some of these may be wrong there is much in the book to commend. With the exception of certain omissions, such as failure to mention the old Chellean (or pre-Chellean) camp site of Torralba, in Spain, the volume is decidedly up to date. The illustrations though numerous often leave something to be desired in point of execution. The sketch map of the district of Les Eyzies (fig.

81) is antiquated. The insertion twice of the same figure of the mammoth carved in ivory from Předmost, first as a piece of Aurignacian sculpture (fig. 201), and then as representing Solutréan art (fig. 229), is apparently due to an oversight. Figure 168 A, representing a mural engraving of the head of a hind, is from Castillo instead of Altamira.

Throughout the book the author's unusual breadth of vision is evident; his power to hold the reader's attention is nowhere relaxed. The new edition of *Ancient Hunters* is perhaps the best work in English covering this particular field.

GEORGE GRANT MACCURDY.

Prehistoric Man and his Story. By G. F. SCOTT ELLIOT, M.A., B.Sc., F.R.S.E., F.L.S., F.R.G.S. (London: Seeley, Service, and Company. 1915. Pp. xvi, 398.)

THIS is the second book by a British author on the general subject of prehistoric man to appear in 1915. The present volume however differs so widely from the one by Sollas that there is room for both. Besides, the work by Elliot includes chapters on the neolithic period, and the age of metals. Both agree in devoting much space to a comparison between prehistoric archaeology and the ethnology of living primitive races.

In the initial chapter, on the preparation of the earth, it is pointed out that remains of lemurs have been found in the Eocene of North America and Europe, and the question is raised whether a "generalized lemur-monkey-man" could have lived at the time. If so he could have wandered all over the northern hemisphere from San Francisco to New Jersey, also from England to Japan. The climate was warm but not oppressively hot. As to food, the land would have been considered a paradise by any living primitive race. The Miocene descendants of the common Eocene ancestor would have had to contend with carnivorous animals.

A discussion of "Homosimius precursor" naturally leads to the question of eoliths. These are flints of various ages which "have certainly been struck or chipped in an unusual way". While it is still not possible to say whether (or not) they were utilized by man, the author believes the evidence in favor of the artifact nature of some of the eoliths is more weighty than that to the contrary.

The next three chapters are devoted to missing links, the human body, and the limit of humanity. As one might expect, comparison of the brains of apes and men shows considerable differences; on the whole, however, the general likeness is more striking than the contrasts. The differences between man and his Pliocene ancestor are "clearly in brain rather than in eyesight or manual dexterity".

The author is a monogenist and also adheres to the orthodox belief that the Old World was the first home of man. There man invented

his first tools and became acquainted with the use of fire. How were the first grass and forest fires produced; by a flash of lightning or a lava flow? Perhaps! but this cannot have been a common origin, for the lightning is usually followed by heavy rain. Early man would flee from volcanic eruptions, and run to some secluded spot during a thunderstorm. Neither occasion would be suitable for first experiments in the use and control of fire. Theobald states that forests in southern India are often set on fire through friction produced by one bamboo branch rubbing against another. It is likewise known that the Negritos of Zambales still make fire by rubbing one bamboo across a nick in another. This was probably the first method employed by early man in the production of fire. The discovery of how to make fire came early and, like the advent of the tool-using habit in general, had a profound influence on the subsequent fortunes of mankind. How long ago these momentous steps were taken is not definitely known. The author thinks it might have been as far back as Pliocene times.

The rather short chapter on the glacial epochs is supplemented by a chronological table, from which it is seen that Elliot differs widely from Sollas. He accepts the Penck system of four glacial epochs with alternating warm episodes and would place the first known Europeans, "*Eoanthropus dawsoni*" and "*Homo heidelbergensis*", in the first of these interglacial epochs, *viz.*, the Günz-Mindel (Penck and also Obermaier would place them in the second). The Chellean, the first cultural epoch, eoliths excepted, is for the author synchronous with the second or Mindel-Riss interglacial epoch. In this he agrees with Penck and Geikie; but differs from Obermaier and Sollas, who believe that the Chellean belongs to the third interglacial epoch (Riss-Würm). The differences of opinion appear still more pronounced when the attempt is made to express length of time in terms of years. For Sollas the Chellean epoch closed only about 27,000 years ago. This same lapse of time the author would estimate at more than 150,000 years.

In discussing the races subsequent to that of Neandertal, the author's statements are open to the possibility of confusing the reader. On page 121 he states that the "Aurignacians seem to have lived on in Europe through the Wurm Ice Age, becoming in course of time the Magdalenians (or race of Cro-Magnon)". On page 163 he likewise speaks of the Cro-Magnon people as Magdalenian ("Madeleinian"). But on the following page one reads: "Yet the Aurignacians, or men of Cro-Magnon, were a primitive people", etc. Again on page 177 the race of Cro-Magnon is called Aurignacian.

In that part of the book devoted to palaeolithic man, the use of such titles for chapter headings as "The First Herdsmen" and "The First Harvest" might lead the unwary to suppose that the domestication of animals and plants was a palaeolithic achievement. The author does not think there is a "single palaeolithic engraving of any of the cat tribe". Such engravings are rare but they are not unknown. On

page 297 one is led to infer that the 840 basketry patterns of the Pomo Indians of California are prehistoric.

Letters, numbers, weights, etc., come in for interesting treatment, the conclusion being that not only the cup-and-ring marks but also a whole series of letters, number-signs, and others were handed on from the palaeolithic to their neolithic successors; and that perhaps it is to the palaeolithic period that we have to look for the origin of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Of the twenty-four plates, ten are from Rutot's reconstructions of early races; and twenty-two of the thirty-eight text-figures are from *Childhood of Man* by Frobenius. Useful references and foot-notes are assembled at the end of each chapter. The author has read widely and travelled extensively. The transmission of his experiences is aided by a luminous imagination. If he has a fault it lies in a too-ready apparent acceptance of data, the value of which is still in the realm of the uncertain.

GEORGE GRANT MACCURDY.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY

Palaeography and the Practical Study of Court Hands. By HILARY JENKINSON, F.S.A., of the Public Record Office, F. W. Maitland Memorial Lecturer, University of Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1915. Pp. 37.)

THIS paper, read before the International Historical Congress of 1912, seeks "not so much to communicate the result of research as to put forward a profession of faith". Its thesis is that for the study of English public records what is needed is chiefly the history of "public administration in all its branches and its most minute details". It is not even true that we want such students "preliminarily trained in *Diplomatique* in the sense in which that highly organized science is usually understood; and though a previous study of facsimiles may save them much time, it is equally untrue that we want them trained in scientific Palaeography". The justification for this contention the author finds in the early and quite extraordinary development of centralized administrative organization in England, resulting in the creation and preservation of a unique body of official records in which actual originals play a relatively small part, and in the decipherment and criticism of which a knowledge of administrative processes is the prime essential. The great majority of these records date themselves, while the large number of scribes who worked on those of any given period offers an obstacle to accurate dating by creating a great variety of "unknown" hands. To illustrate these palaeographical difficulties thirteen facsimiles are given, two of which are skillful forgeries of charters of Henry II., while the others, all relating to the assessment of a fifteenth within a small area of Lincolnshire in 1225, show a remark-

able variety of handwriting which would on purely palaeographical grounds have assigned to them a much more varied provenance both in time and in space.

With Mr. Jenkinson's plea for more attention to administrative history, "that unwritten science", it is easy to find one's self in cordial agreement, both for the sake of the subject itself and for the practical reasons which he cogently urges. The argument against the utility of palaeography and diplomatics does not command so ready an assent, in spite of the able presentation of the Record Office case. Both of these disciplines are conceived in too narrow and formal a fashion and without sufficient regard to their more recent developments. Palaeography certainly includes the kind of study which has been applied to medieval *scriptoria* by Traube and by recent German students of private charters, and which, *mutatis mutandis*, would seem applicable to English scribes as well. So the genetic study of diplomatics gives a large place to the governmental organization and procedure which produced the various classes of documents. The *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, for example, has made it part of its programme, not only to extend the range of diplomatic research to those more recent and more abundant types of documents which Mr. Jenkinson has particularly in mind, but also to pursue such investigations with constant reference to the corresponding administrative organization. What is needed is not the abdication of palaeography and diplomatics in favor of administrative history, but a fresher and less formal study of these subjects in their wider relations to the distinctive problems which the English records present. While Mr. Jenkinson does not seek to exclude these auxiliary sciences from the general programmes of study, one cannot help fearing that the neglect of such subjects by workers in the English public records would isolate them still further from Continental scholarship, at a time when they have yet much to learn from the application of Continental methods to English materials.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

The Chronicle of Novgorod, 1016-1471. Translated from the Russian by ROBERT MICHELL and NEVILL FORBES, Ph.D., Reader in Russian in the University of Oxford, with an Introduction by C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY, D.Litt., Professor of Modern History, University of Birmingham, and an Account of the Text by A. A. SHAKHMATOV, Professor in the University of St. Petersburg. [Camden third series, vol. XXV.] (London: Royal Historical Society. 1914. Pp. xliii, 237.)

EXCEPT for the First Chronicle, commonly called that of "Nestor", none of the longer narrative sources for Russian medieval history has hitherto been translated into Western languages. One is therefore the more inclined to welcome a translation of the oldest and most im-

portant chronicle of the great Russian city-republic, which once ruled over the largest empire in Europe, and which has such special claims upon the interest of the student of political, constitutional, and economic history.

This volume presents what should properly be called the First Novgorodian Chronicle, as distinguished from the other three chronicles of the same name. The First Novgorodian Chronicle has twice been published by the Russian Archaeographical Commission, first in 1841 in the third volume of the *Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles*, and then in 1888 in more exact and scholarly form. The basis of both these editions was the Synodal Transcript, the oldest existing manuscript of the Chronicle, which was probably written in the second quarter of the fourteenth century, and which covers the period from 1016 to 1333. Three later manuscripts offer variants for this period, and also furnish a continuation of the narrative down to 1446, at which date the First Novgorodian Chronicle ends. The translators have, in general, followed the text of the Russian edition of 1888, inserting at the end, however, a long account of the downfall of Novgorodian independence in 1471, which is taken from a chronicle of the sixteenth century. It is to be regretted that they have seldom taken notice of the variants, even when the latter are of decided importance; and that when they have introduced into the text passages from manuscripts other than the Synodal one, or even from other chronicles than the Novgorodian, they have not informed the reader of the source from which they have borrowed.

Those who have dealt with Russian chronicles will recognize the exceptional difficulties that confront a translator. Messrs. Michell and Forbes deserve much praise for their success in preserving the simplicity, the directness, and the laconic vigor of the original. Unfortunately, however, this translation in several respects leaves very much to be desired. In some cases the attempt to render the translation literal has resulted in making it quite unintelligible: *e. g.*, "they gave them peace at all their will" (p. 43)—*i. e.*, on their own terms; or "they . . . fetched in Svyatoslav again with his full liberty" (p. 23)—*i. e.*, on his own conditions. It is utterly misleading to translate *Zagorod'ci* as "those of the outskirts" (p. 60), when the word means "the inhabitants of the *Zagorodny konec*", one of the five wards or "ends" of Novgorod; or to render the word for "tablets" (*i. e.*, the accounts kept by the Novgorodian capitalists of the loans they had made) by "boards" or "rafts" (p. 50). Even more serious are such errors as the following: "Volodimir . . . drowned all of them" (p. 10), which should read, he "imprisoned all of them"; "Rostislav fled . . . having sat in Novgorod eight years and four months" (p. 16)—the Russian text has "one year and four months"; or "the men of Novgorod having ousted Vsevolod beyond the Volok, and in all his land" (p. 40), when the correct version is, "Vsevolod having arrested

the Novgorodians beyond the Volok and in all his land". These mistakes in translation are distressingly frequent.

Like most Russian chronicles, the First Novgorodian is a compilation built up from many sources by many writers in the course of several centuries. The history of the text is summarized in masterly fashion by Professor Shakhmatov, who is, perhaps, the foremost authority in this field of Russian literature.

The uses to which the Chronicle may be put as an historical source are exemplified by Professor Beazley's introductory essay, which describes the rôle played by "My Lord Novgorod the Great" in Russian history; the liberty-loving spirit, the stormy political life, and the thriving commercial activities of the Novgorodians; the far-flung empire, extending even into Asia, which owed allegiance to the city by the Volkhov; and the history of the relations of the republic with the other Russian states and with the Germans, Scandinavians, Lithuanians, and Tartars. One defect, perhaps, may be noted in this introduction: the lack of any detailed description of the laws and institutions of Novgorod, or of the real character and meaning of the incessant party strife, which fills so large a part of the annals of the republic.

R. H. LORD.

The Economic Organisation of England: an Outline History.

Lectures delivered at Hamburg by WILLIAM JAMES ASHLEY, M.A., M.Com., Hon. Ph.D., Professor of Commerce, University of Birmingham. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. viii, 213.)

THIS is a belated notice of an excellent book. The delay has by chance given it an almost pathetic interest. Although published only a year ago and consisting of a group of lectures delivered little more than two years ago by an English scholar before a German audience, so far as the relations between England and Germany go it seems to belong to a past generation, if not to a bygone period. The comradeship in scholarly investigation reflected in these lectures, as it has been in the career of the lecturer, has all gone to wreck, for the present at least, on the primitive passions and brute instincts whose recrudescence is a part of the moral cost of the great war. However, none of these things were in the minds of either speaker or listener when these lectures were given. They are devoted to a quite objective description, without national bias, of the main currents of English economic history.

Professor Ashley has shown good judgment in devoting attention rather to the forms of social organization that have accompanied economic conditions and changes than to the details of those changes themselves. His work is necessarily blocked out on broad lines while actual economic conditions are a matter of infinite detail. He has also given

verisimilitude to his account by frequent reference to present conditions and by comparisons with other countries both in the past and in the present. It is safe to say that no better short statement of the manorial organization of the Middle Ages and its significance for the later history of the different countries of Europe exists anywhere than in the first chapter and in certain later paragraphs of this book. Much the same is true of the chapter on the gilds. These two chapters are restricted in the main to the conditions in England in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The later chapters are devoted to an outline account of the principal changes since that period: the rise of foreign trade and the growing importance of the possession of capital which was so closely connected with it, England's increasing monopoly of her own trading and manufacturing, her experiments in a state-regulated industry under the Tudors, the rise of great estate farming in the eighteenth century, the Industrial Revolution and its concomitants, and the various movements and modifications of capitalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

This organization of his subject is of course not new with Professor Ashley in this book. It is much the same as that used by him in other works written many years ago, and it has been utilized by other writers since. Nevertheless it is here vivified by the result of much new thought and study on his part, and he has introduced into it much that is drawn from later investigations by English, Continental, and American scholars. The last chapter is characteristic of several of these points. After asserting the relatively complete failure of co-operation and profit-sharing in their most important phases, and pointing out the slight progress that has been made in the process of "moralization of employers" under an increasingly complete régime of joint-stock companies, he indicates that the evolution of capitalism during the last half-century, in all the advanced countries alike, has followed its own laws of internal development and taken a very different shape from that prophesied for it by economists or statesmen. This development has shown a strong tendency toward concentration of smaller businesses into large, union of a number of the different steps in production under one control, combination of formerly competing concerns, and collective action of employers in opposition to striking workmen. Professor Ashley interprets these movements as part of an approach toward a condition in which well-organized employers and employed will enter into more harmonious relations with one another, with the government in the background playing the part of an alert protector of the interests of the community.

Whether these generalizations are correct or not only the future can fully determine. So far as the past is concerned this book is a particularly good example of one of the most valuable types of historical writing, a brief general work by a master who has studied so long and thought so widely on his subject that he looks upon it as a

whole, discriminating for his readers its minor technicalities from its permanently significant elements.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

A Life of Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury. By ALGERNON CECIL. (London: John Murray. 1915. Pp. x, 406.)

A COMPREHENSIVE biography of Sir Robert Cecil has been badly needed. In a recent volume on *The House of Cecil* (1914), Mr. Ravenscroft Dennis refers to Sir Robert as an "enigmatical figure", and says that "few great statesmen are so little known, and of few is it more difficult to form a satisfactory judgment". In writing the volume under review, Mr. Algernon Cecil's primary purpose has evidently been to elucidate the character of his illustrious ancestor. He has made use of the great mass of manuscripts preserved at Hatfield House, of manuscripts at the London Public Record Office, and of printed sources. The results are presented in pleasing literary form. Information concerning the events of Cecil's private life is scanty in comparison with the information available concerning his public career; and it is to his public activities that his biographer devotes most space. The story of his life to almost the beginning of his thirtieth year is told in sixty pages. The bulk of the volume deals with the subsequent period of nineteen years, ending with his death in 1612. In this portion of the book, the principal topics dealt with, so far as possible in chronological order, include the case of Dr. Lopez; Cecil's relations with Bacon, Essex, and Raleigh, and his secret understanding with James VI. of Scotland concerning the succession; his mission to France in 1598; his foreign policy, especially with reference to Spain; the Anglo-Spanish negotiations of 1604; his policy towards Catholics and Puritans; and his expedients to improve the state of the public finances in 1608-1610. In order to explain the multitudinous events in which Cecil, while guiding the foreign and domestic policy of England, played a part, the biographer is obliged to make frequent digressions. This necessity occasionally detracts from the unity and interest of the book. On the other hand this inherent difficulty has been largely met by keeping in the foreground, as the most prominent interest, the problem of Cecil's character. The final chapter, of nearly fifty pages, is a discussion of this problem.

Cecil's character has been very variously judged, both by his contemporaries and by ours; and this is doubtless due in great part to his extreme reserve, which amounted almost to secretiveness. His present biographer defends Cecil, but in a moderate and judicial spirit akin to Cecil's own. He carefully examines the question of Cecil's Spanish pension, and in this connection cites a report from the Spanish ambassador in London, made in December, 1611, and now in the Simancas archives, which states that "of all the confidants only El Cid, who is

the Earl of Northampton, is trustworthy and reliable, and that Cecil is as bad as he can be" (p. 361). If, as would appear, Salisbury's "treachery" was only fictitious, his acceptance of the pension is another instance of his "cunning", which his biographer admits was probably "the weak joint in the harness". The more serious accusations against his character his biographer appears to have refuted; and he has succeeded in drawing a consistent and lifelike portrait of a highly conservative and cautious man who wore himself out in laborious and efficient service of his sovereign and country.

An inaccuracy occurs on page 151, where it is stated that "the assumption . . . of an independent sovereignty over the Netherlands by the Archduke Albert and his Spanish bride" was "in accordance with the treaty of Vervins".

The History of England from the Accession of James the Second.

By LORD MACAULAY. Edited by CHARLES HARDING FIRTH, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History, University of Oxford. Volumes V., VI. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1914. Pp. 2083-2624; 2625-3105.)

WITH the appearance of the fifth and sixth volumes of the new edition of Lord Macaulay's *History*, what may be called the mechanical and artistic part of this considerable publishing enterprise is brought to a satisfactory conclusion. What the fate of the more scholarly portion of the task is to be is a question of more importance and possibly less certainty. Among the indirect results of the present Continental struggle not the least remarkable is its effect upon the historical minds of the powers involved. If one may believe the reports which come out of Oxford—and they are largely confirmed by the product of Oxford pens—it would seem that nearly if not quite all history before 1870 has lost its savor, for the time being at least, in the face of the great crisis now confronting Europe and the British Empire. The regius professor himself has again demonstrated the spirit which moved him to review the history of the House of Lords during the Cromwellian era in the light of early twentieth-century developments, and has devoted much time to those modern events which have for the moment overshadowed the seventeenth-century revolutions.

Yet if the final volume should thereby be delayed—and we have no published reason as yet to believe that it will be—there may be compensation. It is inevitable that modern analogies and the revivifying effect on historical study generally which will be the inevitable result of the present war, as they were of the Napoleonic conflict, will lend new interest and perhaps shed new light not merely on the European side of Macaulay's story, but perhaps upon the side relating to the struggle for popular control of government as well. It may be that

the historian of parliamentary triumph may be in for a new lease of life from the same causes which gave such an extraordinary impetus to the study of Cromwell and his age after 1815.

In regard to the volumes now under consideration, they follow, in the main, the lines laid down by their predecessors. As the motive of the narrative gradually swings from the revolution in Great Britain and Ireland to the ensuing Continental struggle, the balance of illustration shifts in like measure, and while we still make our way through the long portrait gallery of English worthies and are edified with reproductions of contemporary documents, we are gradually taken into another atmosphere. Among the English faces appear others of very different type, French, Dutch, Italian, Danish, Spanish, German, even Turkish. To plans of Londonderry and Killiecrankie succeed those of Namur and Landen and Steinkirk, maps of Greenland and of New Caledonia in Darien, plans of Carthage, views of Avignon and Barcelona, of Hanover and the Hague, above all, perhaps, in interest, "draughts" of naval engagements, in particular a fine double page of La Hogue. In this material lies the chief importance of the new edition thus far; and the wide range of subject has one very curious and illuminating effect on the fame of the historian, the more striking for being unconscious. If there are two current criticisms more vigorous than all others, they are that Macaulay was insular and political to a degree which limits greatly the value and general appeal of his work. Yet if one compares this series of illustrations with one which might conceivably be made for Ranke or Klopp—to take the two most prominent Continental works in the same field, works which come, by the way, from precisely the quarters in which these same criticisms have been most freely made—one may realize the infinitely greater catholicity of interest and the scarcely less breadth of view of the English historian when compared to the work of those abstractors of diplomatic documents. One can hardly imagine a view of the Greenland fisheries or of the Skinners' Hall, much less the English port of Bombay or the Tea Table in the reign of Anne, much less the more intimate reproductions of life and customs, literature and art, science and religion, appearing as illuminants of the text of either the Prussian or the Hanoverian historian. But to say this raises again the long-vexed question of Macaulay's rank and qualities as an historian. That it will be raised again and that shortly and vigorously there can be little doubt. For if there is one issue which is most clearly revealed by the appearance of this monumental work it is that a revival of Macaulay from the relative obscurity and discredit into which the past generation of critics and scholars has driven his work, seems more likely to take place than at any time in the past thirty years. Of that these volumes seem a portent.

W. C. ABBOTT.

Memoir of Thomas Addis and Robert Emmet with their Ancestors and Immediate Family. By THOMAS ADDIS EMMET, M.D., LL.D. In two volumes. (New York: The Emmet Press. 1915. Pp. xlvi, 589; xv, 644.)

THESE volumes are the productions of a man who is now more than fourscore years of age and who has worked intermittently at this task for the past half-century. The author claims that in his "work an exhaustive effort has been made for the first time to bring together all the material known to exist in connection with the lives of Thomas Addis and Robert Emmet" (I. xl). With the exception of an Historical Preface, and two papers on Irish history written by the subject of the biography, which occupy the first 150 pages, the first volume is devoted to the life of Thomas Addis Emmet, though the first five chapters of the biography are concerned with the Emmet family and its connections rather than with Thomas Addis Emmet personally. A little more than half of the space in the second volume is allotted to Robert Emmet; the rest of the book is occupied by an appendix containing twenty-five documents of divers sorts, chiefly relating to the Emmet family and to the history of Ireland in the time of Thomas Addis and Robert Emmet. The volumes contain more than a hundred illustrations varying in character from reproductions of portraits and old prints to facsimiles of manuscripts and newspapers. Not the least interesting among them are the facsimiles of the two cablegrams sent to the author of these volumes by the leaders of the Irish Nationalists in 1892 asking for contributions to relieve the distress of the party and acknowledging receipt of the contributions sent for that purpose (II. 330).

Dr. Emmet, a grandson of the Thomas Addis Emmet of whom he writes, came honestly by his antipathy for all things English, and he makes no attempt to conceal his partizanship. He says frankly in the outset that he "offers no apology for the views he expresses in this work; his convictions are as the warp in the construction of cloth; the fabric would be worthless were it omitted" (I. xxvii). This frankness disarms criticism, but the prejudices of the author are so strong that it is necessary to be aware of them in order to appreciate the character of his work. He is convinced that a majority of the inhabitants of the United States "are descended from Irish and German ancestors" (I. xxviii). The contrary view ordinarily held is due to "the power exerted in this country through English influence with the press, in the writing of our school-books, and, as is claimed to be the case, in teaching given in our public schools, and all for England's profit alone" (I. xxviii). Dr. Emmet believes that over sixty per cent. of the population of the United States is "to some extent of Irish blood" (I. xxx). A large number of the settlers in New England were Irish who were obliged to sail from English ports and to take English names. Others

in the same section took as wives Irish girls kidnapped and sent over for that purpose. The "followers of Raleigh, William Penn and Lord Baltimore were nearly all Irishmen", while "the Confederate Yell was the last indication preserved proving" that the settlers in the more southerly parts of the country were largely of the same nationality (I. xxxi). Naturally Dr. Emmet does not accept the views of Irish history current among British authorities and those who agree with them. He regards "that so-called Irish history" as "one continuous, egregious and wilful lie" from the time of "that violator of every precept in the Decalogue, Henry the Second", to the twentieth century (I. 218). We can understand how a writer with the state of mind indicated by these quotations would regard Pitt as "a demon incarnate in Irish affairs" (I. 214). But it would require more evidence than Dr. Emmet brings forward to enable us to understand how he became obsessed with the notion that Pitt and Napoleon, alike hostile in their inclinations toward Ireland, "entered into some compact to forward their ends" (I. 215, 242, 381, 382).

These representative citations make it clear that Dr. Emmet's work has been a labor of such concentrated love that his judgment is biased and his conclusions of little value for an impartial historian. Nevertheless, his work was not done in vain, since it has brought together in an accessible form many documents which will be of material assistance to future students of the lives of his kinsmen and of the history of Ireland in the last years of the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

Geschichte der Befreiungskriege, 1813 u. 1814. Von HEINRICH ULMANN. Band II. (Munich and Berlin: R. Oldenbourg. 1915. Pp. 558.)

THE second volume of Professor Ulmann's *War of the Liberation* begins in August, 1813, with the battles of Dresden, Gross Beeren, and the Katzbach—battles which fulfilled precisely Marmont's sinister prophecy, when warning Napoleon against dividing his forces: "I fear greatly lest on the day on which your Majesty has gained a victory, you may learn that you have lost two." The volume closes with the signature of the peace of Paris in May, 1814, and the departure of the allied monarchs from the French capital—Francis II. to his home, and Alexander and Frederick William to accept the Prince Regent's invitation to visit England. Though the author devotes more than a hundred pages to the battle of Leipzig and a proper relative amount to the lesser engagements, and writes a good, at times graphic, account of military events, his special ability lies in his deft analysis of the shifting diplomacy and psychological motives of the allied leaders. By garnering in the harvest of monographs to which the hundredth anni-

versary gave rise and by his own archival researches, in addition to his thorough acquaintance with the previously existing diplomatic and military accounts, he is able to give a careful, fair, and consistent account of the fluid counsels which continually handicapped the allied headquarters. Of Napoleon he says relatively little; he is looking at the war from the German point of view.

No summary could do justice to the nicety with which the author develops the almost laughable trepidation and hesitation with which the armies of Bernadotte and Schwarzenberg cautiously closed in on Napoleon toward Leipzig, uncertain until the last moment whether to venture a great decisive battle, or, holding discretion to be the better part of valor, to content themselves with threatening his flanks and leaving the way invitingly open for his retreat to the Rhine. Only Blücher showed real activity and genuine eagerness for decisive engagements; but he met with constant and ill-concealed opposition from his own generals; to Yorck he had finally to declare flatly: "The difference between us is that I command and you obey." Similarly, when Napoleon had fallen back for the campaign of 1814 in France, Professor Ulmann traces clearly the conflicting opinions at the "great headquarters" of the Allies. Politics continually interfered with strategy. Alexander and Metternich opposed one another almost to the breaking point, as to whether France should be confined to the boundaries of 1792 and whether the allied army should make straight for Paris or manoeuvre against Napoleon. The czar, with his eye on Galicia, wanted compensation for Austria in Alsace, and, with the memory of the Russian invasion, wanted to cast down Napoleon and all his family; Metternich had to have some regard for his master's son-in-law.

On the whole, Professor Ulmann's estimate of the leaders does not differ greatly from the generally accepted views. To Blücher he rightly gives the greatest credit, but without falling into blind hero-worship. Of Schwarzenberg he paints a more sympathetic and favorable picture than is usually accorded that sorely tried commander-in-chief, who had to march with two emperors and a king in his baggage train—and be responsible for their safety. The three monarchs would not command, but they wanted their advice listened to, and were continually holding councils of war which tied the hands of a general who, like Schwarzenberg, was not a dominating personality. It was partly from the study of Schwarzenberg's letters to his wife, recently published, that the author came to a juster and more favorable opinion of the Austrian commander.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

A History of Travel in America. By SEYMOUR DUNBAR. In four volumes. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1915. Pp. li, 339; 341-740; 741-1124; 1125-1529.)

It is a well-established tradition that the eight large volumes of Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History of America* were projected in order to provide a medium for publishing the editor's valuable but dry and voluminous bibliographical notes. It is a reasonably safe guess that the four volumes of Dunbar's *History of Travel* were published primarily to furnish a setting for the four hundred illustrations that adorn their pages. In fact the author almost admits as much when he says in his preface that "The illustrative material, with its attendant notes, is selected and arranged to form a flowing and connected story of its own, independent of the text."

The subtitle makes the ambitious claim of "Showing the Development of Travel and Transportation from the Crude Methods of the Canoe and the Dog-Sled to the Highly Organized Railway Systems of the present, Together with a Narrative of the Human Experiences and Changing Social Conditions that Accompanied this Economic Conquest of the Continent". Although most of the subjects therein referred to are taken up in the text, it would be quite misleading to imagine that we have here an adequate history of travel in America. In the first place it is really the territory of the present United States and not the whole continent that is under consideration. In the second place the narrative stops with the completion of the first transcontinental railroad in 1869, and there follows only a brief moralizing chapter of sixteen pages labelled "Summary of Present Conditions". In the third place, and most important of all, although the author has acquired a vast amount of information upon his subject, he evidently does not comprehend the development of transportation in its relation to trade and commerce. Without this one cannot write a history of travel.

Under such circumstances it is not altogether surprising to find lacking a correct sense of proportion in considering the subject as a whole. To the serious student of history, it is rather a detriment to have some 350,000 words of text spread over four royal octavo volumes. It is more objectionable to find the half of one volume (II.) together with other occasional pages and chapters, given up to the Indians. If this dealt with the relation of the Indians to travel and transportation it might be excusable, but the blocking by the Indians of the expansion of settlement furnishes the occasion for a lengthy disquisition ending in a sermon upon the treatment of the Indians by the "Caucasians". While this is an extreme case, it illustrates a serious fault in the work.

Furthermore the method of presentation is at times confusing. In one or more chapters it is chronological, then it may be by sections—

New England, South, or West—and then by topic or by method of conveyance. This results in confusion that is not only annoying but misleading. For example, long after having finished with the settlement of Kentucky and Tennessee, and having brought those sections down to at least 1795, we find on later pages, in connection with “travel by wagons”, a consideration of Braddock’s Road which was built in 1755 and was an important connecting link in one of the routes to Kentucky.

These criticisms are severe, but they are directed mainly at the work as “a history of travel in America”, and at the claims that are made in the subtitle. It is only fair to say that a modification of the subtitle at least is under consideration for the new edition which is in process of preparation. In the opinion of the reviewer the illustrations are the real feature of the work, and should be emphasized to the extent of calling this a “pictorial history”. They are interesting and delightful, and it is a great convenience to have in one set of volumes a series of pictures illustrating the whole course of the development of travel in the United States. Many of these pictures are also valuable because of their rarity.

Owing to the character of the paper used, some of the illustrations are not so clearly reproduced as might be desired; the author is at fault in many cases in not giving sufficiently accurate descriptions of the illustrations and stating more definitely whence they have been derived; and too many of the illustrations of early travel have been taken from later prints, as in the case of the *Clermont’s* first trip on the Hudson in 1807 (II. 344–345), where a print of 1856 is used and reference made to the first steamship crossing the Atlantic. But when these criticisms are made and these limitations appreciated, the rest is pure enjoyment.

There are many good things to be found in the text from so much of the author’s storehouse of information as he has placed at the reader’s disposal, although the thread of connection is sometimes so slender as to be barely visible. If one goes through these volumes looking at the illustrations and incidentally reading the text, he is much more likely to pick up some of these choice bits of history than if he attempts to treat the work seriously as a history of travel. In the latter case he is in danger of losing his patience.

In other words, there is much that is well worth while in these volumes. They ought to be taken into consideration by every student of American history. But each student will have to pick out what he needs for himself. The index will not help him, for most of it is impossible of use by any one save the author.

MAX FARRAND.

American State Trials. Edited by JOHN D. LAWSON, LL.D.
 Volumes II., III. (St. Louis, Mo.: F. H. Thomas Law Book
 Company. 1914. Pp. xviii, 937; xx, 909.)

THE second and third volumes of this valuable work will be welcomed by scholars interested in American history, in sociology, in human nature, and by general readers, as well as by jurists. They contain matter which, hitherto, has been inaccessible to almost everyone and which throws light upon the politics, the Constitution, and the customs of the citizens of the United States, with illustrations of the rhetoric prevalent among them during the nineteenth century, besides many interesting narratives. The high standard set by the first volume has been maintained. The trials are published *verbatim* from the original reports. There are apparently no omissions such as too often prevent the reader of a repertory from finding what he seeks.

Dr. Lawson has undertaken a labor that might occupy the time of several scholars. It is consequently no wonder that his notes often omit what might reasonably be expected. This is especially remarkable in the most important case in these two volumes: the trial of Thomas Wilson Dorr for treason against the state of Rhode Island. The bibliography there omits the most valuable collections of material upon the subject: the report of the Burke select committee to the House of Representatives (*House Doc. No. 546*, 28 Cong., 1 sess.), and *The Dorr War*, by Dr. Arthur M. Mowry (Providence, 1901). There is no mention of the attempt to procure the review of the decision of the state court by the Supreme Court of the United States. The application for a writ of habeas corpus was denied because the prisoner was denied the opportunity to apply personally for the same; and it was held that no third person could file a petition on his behalf (*Ex parte Dorr*, 3 Howard 103). When it was sought by an action of trespass to determine which of the two state governments had the better right, the Supreme Court held that the federal judiciary was bound to support the one which had been recognized by the federal executive and consequently refused to pass upon the constitutional questions involved (*Luther v. Borden*, 7 Howard 1).

There is no citation of the places where the reader can find the opinion of the judges of the state supreme court as to the invalidity of the People's Constitution and those of the seven lawyers who supported the contrary contention. It would have been well to mention that Van Buren, Benton, Governor Marcus Morton of Massachusetts, and George Bancroft, the historian, agreed with Dorr's position. A reference to the more modern authorities upon the question, whether a constitution can lawfully be altered by the people in a different manner from that specified in the instrument itself, would also have been illuminating. This is discussed in Jameson's *The Constitutional Convention* (fourth edition), § 563, etc.; in the opinion of the supreme court

of Rhode Island *In re* Constitutional Convention, 14 R. I. 649, A. D. 1883; and in a number of pamphlets published in Rhode Island and elsewhere, including one by Judge Bradley of that state. The letter of President Tyler to Governor King saying that, if necessary to preserve order, he would support the established government, which is quoted in Burke's report and to which reference is made in the arguments upon the trial, might well have been set forth in full. A reference to the place where it can be found might, at least, have been inserted. Even *Ex parte* Bollman and Swartwout, cited in the argument of counsel, is left without a mention of the book where it is reported (4 Cranch 75). It would have necessitated more labor to find and note what is known of the previous trial of Colonel Cooley for acts similar to those of Dorr, which Chief Justice Durfee cited as a precedent against the latter. There is no mention of the trials of Dorr's other adherents: William H. Smith, Dutee J. Pearce, Barrington Anthony, and Benjamin Arnold, jr. It would have added color to the report to have quoted the subsequent act of the assembly held to have been unconstitutional, to which a reference is made. This ordered the clerk of the supreme court for the county of Newport to "write across the face of the record of the judgment the words 'Reversed and Annulled by order of the General Assembly at their January Session A. D. 1854'".

The report of the trial of Bathsheba Spooner does not state that the evidence is quoted from the notes of one of the justices, Jedediah Foster. (His name is there spelt "Jededeah".) And he is the only one of the judges before whom the trial took place whose biography is omitted. It may be found in the *Boston Gazette* of November 9, 1779. He was born in 1726 and died in 1779, his death being the result of a chill, received when crossing Lake Champlain to Fort Ticonderoga upon military service for the state, and of which the effects were increased by his labors in connection with the Massachusetts constitutional convention. He was an officer in the last French and Indian War, as well as during the Revolution. He was recognized as the leading patriot in Massachusetts west of the Atlantic seaboard. According to the tradition of the town of Brookfield, he, and not John Adams, was the author of the first draft of the constitution of Massachusetts. An essay by her grand-nephew, Mr. Samuel Swett Green, argues that Mrs. Spooner was insane at the time of her husband's murder, the cause of her insanity being her condition of pregnancy operating upon an hereditary taint.

The statement by Thurlow Weed as to Whitney's confession concerning the circumstances of Morgan's death is not placed where it would naturally be expected, in the account of the trial of Seymour and others for Morgan's abduction; but is tucked away in the preface, where no one would think of looking for it. It would have been well to have added one or two of the anecdotes concerning Thurlow Weed,

which some might think affected his credibility; at least his famous answer when doubt was expressed as to whether the body found in the Niagara River was that of Morgan, "It is a good enough Morgan until after the election." The trial of Clough for embracery in connection with a libel suit brought by an Anti-Mason should have followed that of Morgan's abductors, instead of being placed in a later part of the volume. In the narrative of Walker's trial for aiding slaves to escape from Florida in 1844, it is said that this was the subject of a poem by Whittier; but we find there no hint that the poem is published at length in the preface.

The Colonel Spencer who appeared for the defendant in the Padrone Ancarola's case was not the slow and sedate James Clark Spencer, formerly judge, of the superior court of the city of New York, and then known as one of the editors of Jones and Spencer's *Reports*; but a rampant criminal lawyer in New York City, called by the bar Charlie Spencer. As the only report was published by the philanthropical society that incited the prosecution, it is not surprising that his speech and cross-examination of plaintiff's witnesses, besides all the evidence offered for the defendant, is omitted and ignored. For this, of course, Dr. Lawson is not responsible.

It is hard to find a reason for the inclusion of the trial of Berthina Tucker.

If the difficulties and delay in the collection of material have prevented the editor from a chronological arrangement, an arrangement that was topical could to some extent have been followed. This would have been a great convenience to the reader. But it seems ill grace to note the demerits of a publication for which all scholars should be grateful. No historical library and no law library can afford to be without it.

ROGER FOSTER.

The French in the Heart of America. By JOHN FINLEY, President of the University of the State of New York. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1915. Pp. x, 431.)

PRESIDENT FINLEY has gathered into a well-printed and well-indexed volume of some 400 pages the lectures delivered by him in Paris and other cities of France, on the Hyde Foundation administered by Harvard University. The historical portions of the lectures are taken mainly from Parkman, "without whose long labors", says the lecturer, "I could not have prepared these papers". One lecture is devoted to Parkman, and in twenty or more scattered references there is sufficient material for a complete biographical sketch of that historian. Samuel M. Clemens also receives due attention as a descriptive writer. "Mark Twain has put forever on the map of letters (where the Euphrates, the Nile, the Ilyssus, the Tiber, the Seine, the Thames have long been) the Missis-

sippi, the river which the French first traced on the maps of geography." Autobiographical material abounds.

The lectures are composed in rhetorical narrative style after this fashion: "There was ample seed by now, and still more was soon to be added, for very soon, the same year, the gentle Garnier is to die the same death ministering to these same Hurons, whose refugees, flying beyond two lakes to escape from their murderous foes, are to lure the priests still further on westward till, even in their unmundane thoughts, the great mysterious river begins to flow towards a longed-for sea" (p. 33). Or this: "From the *coureurs de bois*, 'runners of the woods,' whom he [Champlain], tied by the interests of his feeble colony to the Rock, had sent out, enviously no doubt, upon journeys of exploration and arbitration among the Indians, and from the Gray Friars and Black Gowns who, inflamed of his spirit, had gone forth through the solitudes from Indian village to village, from suffering to suffering, reports had come which he must have been frequently translating with his practiced hand into river and shore line of this precious map, the original of which is still kept among the proud archives of France" (p. 23). The author displays a passion for epithetical adjectives. Thus we have among others "the Homeric Parkman" (p. vi), "the blind Parkman" (p. 44), and "the Puritan Parkman" (p. 66); the "mendacious" and the "hungry" Hennepin; the "aboriginal insects"; and "the equator-sloping half of the continent".

George Washington's part in winning this country first from France and afterwards from England is adverted to; and a long leap is taken in the chapter "From La Salle to Lincoln". Yet the historical portions of the lectures really furnish the foundation for the superstructure, which is comprised in those chapters dealing with the development of the basins of the Great Lakes and the Mississippi. The French auditors were told that, "One harvest, in the picturesque words of Mr. Casson, would buy Belgium, two would buy Italy, three would buy Austro-Hungary, and five, at a spot-cash price, would take Russia from the Czar." And this before the great war began! From the many such expositions of the material wealth of this country the French easily discover whence comes the money Americans spend in Paris. The lack of conservation heretofore displayed by our people is lamented and explained; and the visible signs of amendment of our ways are mentioned. We miss the excellent illustrations that accompanied those chapters which were published in one of the magazines. In France (where so many of the sources from which American writers have drawn are available) exception might be taken to calling Nicolet a *coureur de bois*. Not only does Sulte maintain that the class did not come into existence until about 1670, but Nicolet had none of their characteristics. So, too, a Frenchman, familiar with Marquette's writings would regard him as the last man "to quiet his morbid conscience, which must have reproved his exploring ambitions". The absolute sincerity of Marquette shines through everything written by or about him.

Letters and Papers relating to the Cruises of Gustavus Conyngham, a Captain in the Continental Navy, 1777-1779. Edited by ROBERT WILDEN NEESER. [Publications of the Naval History Society, vol. VI.] (New York: The Naval History Society. 1915. Pp. liii, 240.)

WHILE most of the official correspondence dealing with the predatory voyages of Captain Conyngham and the hardships which fell to his lot in British prisons has already been printed in various collections of Revolutionary documents, the zeal of the editor of this volume has added several interesting papers, some of which, he thinks, go "deeper into the well-springs of history" than the published record. From all these he has constructed a consistent narrative of his hero's roving cruises, his sufferings in captivity, and his unavailing pleas for recognition and reward from the American government. His conclusion agrees with that of Fenimore Cooper, who regarded Conyngham as a duly commissioned captain in the United States navy throughout the period when his prizes were taken. He was therefore not exposed to the penal laws against piracy, even if his commissions were "intended for temporary expeditions only and not to give rank in the Navy", as declared in an adverse report by a committee of Congress in 1784.

Nevertheless, Conyngham was apt to sail rather close to the margin of piracy, and charges were brought against him by other than British authorities. Nations which had not recognized the United States might well object to the disturbance of their trade by the seizure of English goods in neutral ships, whether this was done by Conyngham's orders or by the mutinous interference of his undisciplined crew, as in the case of a French and a Swedish prize taken while his cutter, the *Revenge*, haunted the Spanish coasts. The irritation which led to the harsh treatment of Conyngham upon his capture by the British fleet in 1779 was due to his audacity in taking the mail-packet for Holland in the Narrow Seas and bringing her into Dunkirk, whence he had sailed a few days before. In 1777 France still sought to "keep appearances" with the English ministry, and Conyngham was arrested and his prizes restored. This proceeding served to keep his crew in hand, and the *Revenge*, a cutter in which Conyngham was captured after two years of predatory cruising, sailed under bonds to make a direct voyage to America in July, 1777. Conyngham had a naval commission for this vessel from the American commissioners in Paris, but he finished his voyage as a privateer, the cutter having been sold upon her arrival in America early in 1779. His irregular captures had closed all Spanish ports to him before he left European waters, and his privateering course lasted only a month as he was taken off New York on April 27, 1779.

To Sir George Collier, commodore and commander-in-chief of the British ships in America—described in the index as "Commander, R. N."—Conyngham was a criminal who had to be sent to England for

punishment; and shackles and black-holes were within his deserts. Cruelty was abated after his arrival at Plymouth, though he was committed for high treason like other mariners in Mill Prison. The charge of piracy was dropped after Congress had certified that he was duly commissioned and that a British officer should suffer in retaliation for Conyngham's rigorous treatment. While rated as an exchangeable prisoner he had the good fortune to escape to the Continent in November, 1779. He was recaptured in March, 1780, but he seems to have been treated as an ordinary prisoner during the ensuing year. This can hardly be called a "glorious record" for a naval officer, but Mr. Neeser credits him with sixty-odd prizes, only a few of which were successfully brought into port, and his activity doubtless raised the rates of marine insurance in London.

The man himself fails to emerge from the documents here accumulated. He could not tell his own story—even his diary fails to supply a consecutive report; and the only finished piece of sentimental rhetoric attributed to his pen is found in a petition on his behalf from the merchants of Philadelphia, where he was known as a resident. The Conyngham who applied for French citizenship in 1777 may have been another Irishman of that name, though Mr. Neeser does not say so.

The Spanish port called St. Anthonys (perhaps Santander) is neither indexed nor identified. "Comte d'Estaing" in a note is hardly an improvement on Conyngham's phonetic "de Stang"; and Gérard de Rayneval is entitled to his accent. But in general the editorial care shown in this volume is worthy of the handsome form in which the Naval History Society issues its publications.

C. G. CALKINS.

The Diplomacy of the War of 1812. By FRANK A. UPDYKE, Ph.D., Ira Allen Eastman Professor of Political Science, Dartmouth College. [The Albert Shaw Lectures in Diplomatic History, 1914.] (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1915. Pp. 494.)

THE completion of a century of peace between the United States and Great Britain is a supremely fitting time for the present extended review of the negotiations which terminated the War of 1812. If no other reason existed, it would be worth while to press home once more by such a temperate and judicious study as this the realization of how far the two nations have gone along the high road to mutual understanding and appreciation—as far, for example, as from Francis Jackson to James Bryce. This solid volume of eleven chapters gains added significance from its appearance in an hour of acute interest in war and diplomacy, when its statements of England's policy of a century ago regarding present-day questions of blockade, seizure of ships and goods, and the motives and status of her enemy, take on a peculiar meaning.

Professor Updyke's work as a whole presents the results of a thorough survey of all available materials in a clear and discriminating manner, though he has discovered no bodies of new facts which compel any considerable shift in the centre of gravity of established judgments of men or measures. He gives himself the benefit of any doubts about the extent of his functions as a diplomatic historian. The first third of the book is devoted to questions at issue between the two nations during the twenty years before war was declared, such as Great Britain's irritating and humiliating aggressions upon American citizens, commerce, and national dignity. The last two chapters trace out to their final settlement the various topics discussed during the negotiations for peace, even when such settlements were so much later that they may be considered as a part of the diplomacy of the war only by an extreme stretch of historical courtesy. The history of the diplomacy of the suppression of the slave-trade, for example, is brought down to 1863 and 1890; the disputes as to boundaries to 1842; and the fisheries question to 1912. The ebb and flow of discussions between the two commissions regarding the Indians, Louisiana, boundaries, and the northeastern fisheries is clearly described. The freshest chapter in the volume is that entitled Ratification and Reception of the Treaty. It is the only one, however, which suggests the vivacity and charm of the four chapters on American diplomacy during the war in the great work of Henry Adams.

For Professor Updyke, as for other writers on this period, the *American State Papers* prove to be a veritable quarry out of which to dig ready-hewn stones in much the same way as the Romans of the seventeenth century dug building blocks from the ruins of the Colosseum. His new structure is dignified, well-proportioned, expansive, and comfortable, but quite lacking in distinction of style, even when decorated with small importations from the British archives and with gossip from the Russell Papers and the Crawford Transcripts (pp. 382-384). Probably the Russell Papers yielded quite as much as was expected, for Jonathan Russell had neither breadth, depth, nor keenness of mind, a fact admirably shown in the story here told of his use in 1822 of a garbled "copy" of his letter of 1815 to Monroe, when he was trying to prevent the nomination of Adams for the presidency.

This volume is notably free from errors, as a rule, but it is quite unpardonable to refer to William Jones as Secretary of War (p. 147), and slightly misleading to give "Monroe Papers, MS." as reference for Gallatin's important letter of October 26, 1814, to Monroe, when the letter was long ago printed in full in the *Writings* of Gallatin.

KENDRIC C. BABCOCK.

A History of the Western Boundary of the Louisiana Purchase, 1819-1841. By THOMAS MAITLAND MARSHALL. [University of California Publications in History, vol. II.] (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1914. Pp. xiii, 266.)

THIS monograph is a doctoral dissertation but it is not to be classed with the usual run of such contributions either in method, content, or results. The author has attacked a problem which many writers have left unsolved and has solved it with apparent success and finality. The main body of the work is concerned with an examination of the various positions taken by the United States and Mexico, with Texas as the latter's successor after 1837, from the signing of the Florida treaty to the final adjustment of the boundary between Texas and Louisiana in 1841. As a preliminary to the main topic the writer has re-examined the evidence as to the extent of Louisiana between 1803 and 1819 with some valuable and interesting results. The key to the policy of the United States after 1803 he finds to be the final opinion, not reached until the spring of 1804, of Jefferson as to the limits of the Louisiana Purchase. "Starting with the idea that the purchase was confined to the western waters of the Mississippi Valley, the conception had gradually extended until it included West Florida, Texas, and the Oregon country, a view which was to be the basis of a large part of American diplomacy for nearly half a century" (p. 14), a conception, as has long been shown, historically quite erroneous. The instructions to Victor, urged by Mr. Henry Adams as evidence that Louisiana extended to the Rio Grande, are shown to have been based upon a misreading of maps, and, what is more to the point, of little cogency as against Spain. Incidentally Mr. Adams is corrected in another particular: the famous bath-tub episode, associated with Napoleon's determination to dispose of Louisiana, occurred in October, 1802, and not in April, 1803.

While on the one hand the American attitude toward the western boundary of Louisiana was determined largely by Jefferson's opinion, the policy of Spain, at first one of protest, became by 1804 one "to restrict Louisiana to the narrowest bounds possible" (p. 19). The idea of a neutral ground, appearing in the Wilkinson agreement, was greatly extended in Madison's proposals and continued to appear until the close of the first stage of the negotiations, suspended until after the Bourbon restoration. An important clue to Adams's diplomacy is furnished by the suggestion that Adams did not trade claims to Texas for the Floridas, but the Floridas being in effect lost to Spain, the claims to Texas, such as they were, were exchanged for a Spanish quit-claim to the Oregon country, a suggestion which fits in with the memorable entry of Adams upon the signature of the treaty. The value of Mr. Marshall's treatment of Spain's policy during the Florida negotiation is much enhanced by his use of the hitherto unused boundary reports of Talamantes and Pichardo, a reproduction of the latter's map appearing as the frontispiece to the book.

The desire of the United States to acquire at least a part of Texas, suspected by Mexico as early as 1824, colored the relations of the two countries from the beginning. The delay in the ratification of the treaty of 1828 and the unwarranted assumption by Van Buren that the Neches was the Sabine appear in a somewhat sinister light when accompanied by a restatement of the Anthony Butler intrigue. As to the latter, Mr. Marshall disagrees with Mr. Barker, who acquitted Jackson of improper motives in an article in the *American Historical Review* (XII. 788-809). The activities of General Gaines, culminating in his occupation of Nacogdoches, and the subsequent Gorostiza-Forsyth correspondence, are viewed as a part of Jackson's unneutral attitude toward Mexico. In the reviewer's opinion this chapter is the least convincing in the book. That violations of neutrality were winked at is notorious, but pro-Texan rather than anti-Mexican popular sentiment was responsible for this and the evidence is confused by the quarrel of Gaines, Scott, and Macomb. The difficulties between Texas and the United States over the boundary after 1837 present a new and fruitful topic. The United States did not desire territory at the expense of Texas, the line of 1819 was renewed, and Van Buren's claim to the Neches was quickly found to be untenable. The book closes with an interesting account of the work of the international commission which ran the boundary from Sabine Pass to the Red River. Incidentally to the main narrative the writer shows that Houston's idea of an Anglo-Texan understanding was expressed as early as 1837. The claim is made that Jackson's decision as to recognition was probably influenced by his interviews with Santa Anna. If so, the evidence is not conclusive and that Morfit's final reports were controlling seems more likely.

The narrative as a whole is carefully and interestingly presented and it is helped greatly by the thirty maps prepared by the author to illustrate the text. Nowhere else can one find graphically set forth the various proposals and counter-proposals from 1803 to 1835. One set of maps shows the development of Jefferson's conception; another gives the expansion of the neutral ground idea; a third sets out the many lines suggested during the Florida negotiations, while a fourth traces the various attempts to purchase territory from Mexico. All are excellent though two criticisms may perhaps be made: the area of the Wilkinson neutral ground seems to be too great, while the position of the Arroyo Hondo is apparently too far to the east.

JESSE S. REEVES.

Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois. Herausgegeben von JULIUS GOEBEL. [Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter, Jahrgang 1914, vol. XIV.] (Chicago: The Society. 1915. Pp. 693.)

USEFUL and valuable contributions alternate in the present *Jahrbuch*. The beginning is made with a collection of unpublished letters

of Carl Follen, presented by Professor Herman Haupt of the University of Giessen, author of *Karl Follen und die Giessener Schwarzen* (1907). Especially interesting are the letters that passed between the brothers Carl, August, and Paul, all of them refugees, Carl laboring constructively in the cause of abolition, not less of religious tolerance and scholarship in his adopted country, the oldest brother August, the poet, teaching in Switzerland, the youngest, Paul, soon destined to follow his brother Carl, but unfortunately not to the seat of growing American intellectual life, but to become the leader of a colony (*Giessener Auswanderungsgesellschaft*, 1834) on the banks of the Missouri, a post for which he was temperamentally unfit. We get glimpses of Carl Follen's daily life in Cambridge in his letters to his father. Carl Beck's letter to Professor Jung of Basel written very shortly after the death of Carl Follen at sea in the fire-horror of the *Lexington*, January 13, 1840, reflects the loss deeply felt of one of the most brilliant men of the age.

The second number in the *Jahrbuch* is a collection of German-American lyrics of the eighteenth century by H. A. Rattermann. They include mainly the hymns of the brothers and sisters of the Ephrata monastery, though poetic effusions of Pastorius, the Revs. Helmuth and Kunze, Conrad Weiser, Henry Miller, Zinzendorf, and many others add to the curious interest. "The Early Influence of Wagner in America" is outlined by Viola E. Knoche, while Professor F. I. Herrriott adds new material to his foregoing study of the "Germans in Iowa and the Two-Year Amendment of Massachusetts", in his present article entitled, "The Germans in the Gubernatorial Campaign of Iowa in 1859". Otto Lohr unfolds a picture of the German element in the United States exactly one hundred years ago, describing their share in the social and economic affairs of the country, and their participation in the war on land and sea.

The article which stands out prominently in the *Jahrbuch* is one on a subject long awaiting attention, "German-American Jews", by Herman Eliassof. The author divides the Jewish immigrations to America into three periods. The earliest was that of the Sephardim, Spanish or Portuguese refugees, many of whom came by way of Holland. They settled first at New Amsterdam, but when persecuted established their main colony at Newport, R. I. These settlers delivered an address to George Washington on the occasion of his visit to Newport in 1790; the President's gracious reply is reprinted by Mr. Eliassof. There were some German Jews among the Sephardim, and there is a record of some settling at Shafersville and Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and also at Leitersville, Maryland. The second immigration was that of the Ashkenazim, the German Jews, covering principally the period of the Mexican War, the Rebellion, and the Reconstruction period. The third and last epoch of Jewish immigration to the United States is

known as the Russo-Polish, including many immigrants from Galicia and Rumania, and beginning with the close of the nineteenth century.

The author tells us, that the Sephardim were conservative, haughty, and aloof, and while they prepared the way for the Ashkenazim, the latter were really the progressive element, enterprising in commerce and industry, zealous in establishing religious, educational, and benevolent institutions. "The German Jewish immigrants brought with them a highly developed double culture, a strong combination of Jewish ethics and German civil virtue." In 1843 twelve German-American Jews founded the "Independent Order B'nai B'rith", the New York lodge becoming the parent of chapters throughout the United States, in Europe, even in Asia and Africa. Their ideals of benevolence, brotherly love, and harmony entered into the life of the Jews of America; solidarity, patriotism, and charity were fostered by them. The German Jews are responsible for the organization of the Hebrew charities, which are a model for all the world. The Jewish Publication Society will soon add to its achievements a new translation of the Bible, made possible by the donation of \$100,000 by Mr. Jacob H. Schiff. A series of interesting biographical sketches, by no means exhaustive, appears in this essay, of German-American Jews, names that shine as stars of the first magnitude in business and charity, in education and the professions. The list closes with the careers of the leaders, Dr. Emil G. Hirsch of Chicago, Simon Wolf of Washington, Jacob H. Schiff, and Oscar S. Straus of New York. The total Jewish population in the United States in 1914 Mr. Eliassof estimates at 2,500,000, of which the city of New York contains over 1,000,000. Of these about one-fifth are German Jews. Up to 1848 the Portuguese Jews, estimated at 50,000, were in the majority, after which the German Jews became more numerous than all others. From 1905 the Russo-Polish immigration exceeded all others and continues to do so. The oldest and newest Jewish immigrations have shown a tendency to concentrate in cities or definite districts, while the German Jews are more equally distributed over the entire country.

A. B. FAUST.

Reconstruction in Georgia, Economic, Social, Political, 1865-1872.

By C. MILDRED THOMPSON, Ph.D. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, vol. LXIV., no. 1.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1915. Pp. 418.)

THIS study adds an interesting and comprehensive volume to the growing list of special investigations of Reconstruction in the separate states. Georgia, though the last state to be readmitted to the Union, suffered less than her sister states, partly because the negroes did not so heavily overbalance the whites, and partly because many respectable

white men, some of Southern birth, some of Northern birth but long residence in the state, assumed the leadership that elsewhere was seized by the carpet-bagger. "On the whole, as far as personnel is concerned, the reconstruction administration of Georgia was not entirely bad, was even quite good in some members. This praise, faint as it is, is more than can be given to most of the governments of the Southern states in 1868."

The text comprises, besides an introductory chapter on Georgia in the war, three distinct parts. The first, Economic Readjustment and Reorganization, deals with the transition from slavery to freedom, 1865-1866, with the consequent labor, commercial, social, and political readjustments. The second, Military and Political Reconstruction, 1867-1872, details the unsavory story of Congressional Reconstruction in its two periods, with the final victory of home rule and the flight of Governor Bullock. The third, Economic Progress and Social Changes, explains the rapid recovery of the state, particularly in the northern portion, from the devastation of the war, and seeks to trace the permanent residuum of Reconstruction in its largest sense. Each part is treated in considerable detail, and in a candid and impartial spirit.

An adequate review of the wealth of interesting material presented would exceed the limits of assigned space; but a few points may be selected. In her treatment of Georgia's sole experiment with a state income tax, during the progress of the war, the author seems to have overlooked W. A. Shelton's valuable monograph. The Freedmen's Bureau, so hotly resented by most Southerners of the day, seems on the whole to be vindicated in the opinion of the author, who declares it "an important constructive force towards economic adjustment in the immediate transition from slavery to freedom". Still at times it was "badly mismanaged, granting unnecessary support and unnecessary tutelage and guardianship to the freedmen, and teaching them to distrust the whites". And again, "Many of the subordinate agents were incompetent, unfit for what was a most difficult and delicate work." "They manipulated the helpless black voters for their own aggrandizement." *Per contra*, the Ku Klux movement was "to protect white citizens and to bring some order out of social chaos when bayonet was law, when government and justice were in the hands of their opponents". "This was primarily a movement of regulators, to administer rude justice where courts and officers of law were inadequate." The striking career of Joseph E. Brown, "the power behind the throne", in his triple rôle of leader in Secession, in Reconstruction, and in restoration of democratic home rule, is vividly portrayed, though the author does not venture an explicit estimate of his character or performance. Governor Bullock is more summarily disposed of: "A careful reading of Bullock's defense fails to bring conviction that he disproved a single charge of the investigating committee."

The social and economic transformation wrought by the forces set

at work by emancipation and the waste of the war is still in progress. The years from 1865 to 1872 are only the beginning; and their only unity lies in the political abnormality that ceased in 1872. Reconstruction in Georgia meant a wider democratization of society. The way was opened to the middle class; other kinds of wealth than land and slaves became the basis of social prestige. "The reconstruction period was followed by shifting, not only in class dominance, but also in sectional dominance. The center of influence moved further to the uplands, with growing importance of the Piedmont region, at the expense of the cotton-belt." Reconstruction brought about a greater social democracy; the white was freed, as well as the black. But the process was painful and costly to the last degree.

The book is provided with a good table of contents, but unfortunately lacks an index.

J. H. T. MCPHERSON.

A History of Indiana from its Exploration to 1850. By LOGAN ESAREY, Ph.D., Instructor in Western History, Indiana University. (Indianapolis: W. K. Stewart Company. 1915. Pp. ix, 515.)

ON the eve of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Indiana to statehood it is opportune that there should appear a history which shows the product of much original research, and which has been brought together in the modern historical spirit. Probably no field of American history has been so neglected as that of the separate states. This is particularly true of Indiana, and the field is still open for a history that will cover the whole period, since Mr. Esarey's contribution closes with 1852.

The history of Indiana as one of the frontier states is suggestive of the distinctive part which the frontier has played in the warp and woof of American history. An added appreciation of the history of Indiana will give a new appreciation of our nation's development, particularly as the one hundredth year of her history coincides with the great national era.

In his preface, Mr. Esarey points out the difficulties which one now meets in investigating the historical data concerning Indiana and he states that he has traced his facts to primary sources and has excluded from his book many traditional stories popularly regarded as substantial history but which have been found to be without historical foundation. The text of 490 pages is divided into twenty-one chapters. Chapter I. is given to the French period. The English period is treated in chapter II. and the conquest by Virginia, during the Revolutionary War, is described in chapter III. The closing campaigns of the Revolution as they are related to this region furnish the subject-matter of chapter IV. and chapter V. deals with the Indian wars, 1790-1796.

Chapter VI. consists of a history of the government of the Northwest Territory and chapter VII. is devoted to Indiana Territory, 1800-1816. Chapter VIII. treats of Indiana's relation to the War of 1812, and chapter IX. gives the transition from the territory to statehood. The remaining chapters tell the history of the state from 1816 to 1852. Chapter X. relates to the state government at Corydon. Chapter XI. traces the economic development from 1825 to 1835; and the beginnings of religious and educational activities are outlined in chapter XII. Politics from 1825 to 1840 is described in chapter XIII. and a history of the removal of the Indians from the state is given in chapter XIV. The survey and sale of public lands in the state is discussed in chapter XV.; the subject of internal improvements in which Indiana was so greatly engaged is well presented in chapter XVI.; and the second and third state banks of Indiana furnish the subject-matter for chapter XVII. Chapter XVIII., entitled the Pioneers and their Social Life, is one of the best in the book. It gives a plain, matter-of-fact account of the early life and conditions in the state. Indiana's part in the Mexican War is treated in chapter XIX., and the history of the constitutional convention of 1850 is given in chapter XX. The last chapter is devoted to Indiana politics from 1840 to 1852.

One cannot help regretting that the author has closed his history at such an early date, especially since Dillon in his history of Indiana published in 1858 covered so thoroughly the territorial period.

The style of the author is clear and direct, but somewhat heavy. The emphasis is well placed and the subjects are treated with due proportion. The institutional history is well covered topically and the chapters are subdivided in a way to show the connection with the general subject.

The author has used a great deal of original material but has interpreted it in his own language. He treats the old traditions sympathetically, but shows that they are largely false, and that the facts do not warrant many of the conclusions which the people have made. The subject-matter is interspersed with many anecdotes which add interest. While the discussion lacks detail yet it is accurate.

One of the commendable features is the foot-notes, and the author has given a brief estimate of the relative value of his authorities which is quite worth while. Another very attractive feature of the book is the collection of fifteen maps illustrating the development of the state to 1852. There is a good summary of the civil institutions of the state. The volume is provided with a good bibliography of twelve pages, although it might to advantage have been made more complete. The index could have been improved upon.

All in all, Mr. Esarey has made a distinct contribution to the history of Indiana, and in so doing to the history of the nation, and one may hope that he will carry forward the work to a more recent time.

History of Social Legislation in Iowa. By JOHN E. BRIGGS.
[Iowa Social History Series, edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh.] (Iowa City: State Historical Society. 1915. Pp. xiv, 444.)

History of Poor Relief Legislation in Iowa. By JOHN L. GILLIN.
[Iowa Social History Series, edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh.] (Iowa City: State Historical Society. 1914. Pp. xiv, 404.)

THESE two volumes of the *Iowa Social History* series make a notable addition to the informational, scholarly, and original publications of the Iowa Historical Society. "Scholars are no longer called upon to prove that the story of social progress is history." "The modern point of view in all legislation is social." These statements from the editor's introduction give a key to both volumes.

The term "social legislation" in Mr. Briggs's hands has a broad scope. He definitely traces two classes of legislation, namely that affecting particular classes (dependents, defectives, delinquents, pensioners, and laborers) and that affecting society in general (public health, public safety, public morals, and domestic relations). This discussion is divided into two parts, the first being a treatment of the history of the question based on the enactments found in each of the six more or less formal law codes in Iowa's history, the last one being dated 1897, and the second (pp. 145 to 347) being a description of Iowa's social legislation during the last sixteen years. The development of public concern for social welfare during these more recent years is clearly pictured, and the preventive rather than merely remedial aim of much of the more recent legislation is properly commended. The story of this legislation is interesting, and the book is a useful one. The nature of the subject, however, and the necessity for covering so much ground with so many lines of development carried along together, necessarily give the work something of a disconnected character. But it is packed full of authoritative information on the subject.

The *History of Poor Relief Legislation* in Iowa is precisely what the title states, *i. e.*, an historical treatment not of the system of poor relief as a whole, but of the legislative side of it in Iowa. It is a careful and painstaking review of the principles and methods involved in this legislation. It is written from the standpoint of a trained sociologist, who believes that the present plan of public poor relief in Iowa is inadequate and antiquated and that more scientific methods of carrying it on should be introduced. Part I. traces poor relief legislation from the time of the old Northwest Territory through the successive changes under territorial and state governments of Iowa to 1914. Part II. deals with special phases of the subject, such as county relief officials, the poorhouse, outdoor relief, etc. Part III., perhaps the most interestingly written of all, changes the point of view and

gives a discussion of what the legislation has been for special classes such as defectives, soldiers' orphans, normal children, vagrants, etc. Part IV. consists of two brief chapters of summary and suggestions. Two of the most important of these suggestions are to group several of the counties into one "poor district" and to secure more competent township overseers. Undoubtedly this work will have an important effect leading to improvement in the legislation for and the administration of poor relief in Iowa. It is a matter for regret that a careful study of the administrative shortcomings of the system could not have been included; this, however, was not the aim or plan of Dr. Gillin, and indeed it could not have been included in the present study without making the volume too bulky.

The sections in both books devoted to "Notes and References" (50 pp. in Briggs and 40 pp. in Gillin) testify to the care and thoroughness of the work, and afford to students good bases for further study. The analytical index in each book is well made and ample.

PAUL F. PECK.

Sir George Étienne Cartier, Bart., his Life and Times: a Political History of Canada from 1814 until 1873. By JOHN BOYD. (Toronto and New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xxi, 439.)

SIR GEORGE ÉTIENNE CARTIER had a striking career. He was a Radical who followed the rebel Papineau in 1837. Later he became the Conservative or Bleu leader of the French Canadians. In 1858 he became prime minister. He was one of those who brought about the federal union completed in 1867 and he died in 1873, a leading member of the Conservative cabinet of Sir John Macdonald. This book is published to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of Cartier's birth in 1814. Sir George Étienne Cartier was one of the four French Canadians who have attained to a national reputation. There is a dual political life in Canada. Leaders of French blood are sharply, quite too sharply, marked off from those of British origin. Men of Irish, Scottish, and English birth soon find themselves merged in a common nationality. The French alone remain distinct, mingling little with the other races and preserving, apparently with growing intensity, their cult of nationality—"notre langue, nos institutions, nos lois". For them the chief interest of this book will be the emphasis which it lays on Cartier's spirit of nationalism and the admiring tribute paid to it by the English-speaking author. Cartier thought himself a poet, which he was not, and wrote a mediocre national song still often heard. He loved French literature; he was a zealous Catholic; he was most really at home among the plain country people. All this we have in this book and it constitutes an admirable revelation of the spirit of French Canada. But the book is more than this. It is a study in good clear Eng-

lish of the origin and the working of a federal system of government. The author has used Cartier's own papers; he has studied debates and newspapers and has, besides, read the best secondary authorities.

When Canada has twenty or thirty millions of people instead of eight or nine the world will come to understand the importance of the experiment in federal government which the Dominion represents. For Canada has a federal system, monarchical in spirit, but divorced from Old World conceptions of rank and authority. It is a pure democracy, indeed, with not even the restraints upon the popular will imposed by a powerful second chamber such as that of the United States. Quite possibly the monarchical traditions would have led to a complete legislative union among all the Canadian provinces but for the dualism caused by the separate identity of the French Canadians in the province of Quebec. Sir John Macdonald, the first federal prime minister of Canada, was no friend of federalism. He desired for Canada centralized authority in a single Parliament, a strong government on the model of that of the United Kingdom. Cartier was the leader of the French Canadians. He favored union, but he would have only federal and not legislative union. Macdonald gained one chief point. The fatal error of the federalism of the United States was, as he thought, "in making each state a distinct sovereignty, in giving to each a distinct sovereign power. . . . The true principle of confederation lies in giving to the general government all the principles and powers of sovereignty, and in the principle that the subordinate or individual states should have no powers but those expressly bestowed upon them." From the urgency of Macdonald on this point has come the relative weakness of the province in Canada, compared with the state in the United States.

Cartier supported another aspect of federalism, unknown in the United States. French Canada, like Louisiana long ago, had a Church so backed by the State as to be in effect a state establishment. Under the federalism of the United States anything like a state establishment of religion in Louisiana was bound to disappear. In the province of Quebec, however, the Church retains the legal privileges of the days of Louis XIV.; it levies the tithe, it controls the education of Catholic children, and so on. The opponents in French Canada of federalism before 1867 said that it would destroy the characteristic features of French-Canadian life. Cartier said that it need not do so. By amazing skill he induced the church authorities to accept his view and he led French Canada into a federal union in which the English-speaking and Protestant element was certain to become ever more dominant. Yet he saved the Catholic system in the province of Quebec and the peculiar racial position of the French Canadians, a great political feat.

All this constitutes the chief interest of this book. It covers other things, however, and two above all. Cartier was among the pioneers in encouraging the building of railways in Canada. He was one of

the chief authors of the great Grand Trunk Railway system which is to-day transcontinental in character. Napoleonic for those days in his conceptions of railway enterprise, he was a direct imitator of Napoleon in another sphere. After the British conquest Canada retained the old French civil law, the *Coutume de Paris*. It was a system puzzling to lawyers even and offering much encouragement to the litigious. Napoleon had finally reformed the similar system in France by his famous Code and Cartier did the same in Canada. On the lines of the *Code Napoléon* he codified the old French law and created the present legal system of the province of Quebec. It is wholly different from that in any other Canadian province, and is no unimportant factor in the strength of French-Canadian nationalism.

Mr. Boyd makes some slips. How could Pierre Cartier, an alleged brother of Jacques Cartier, flourish in the *seventeenth* century (p. 3)? He speaks repeatedly of the feudal dues, *cens et rentes*, as *cens et ventes*. He exaggerates the meaning of the victory of Colonel de Salaberry at Châteauguay (p. 28). The book becomes more accurate towards the end and is a decidedly creditable production. Its details will interest only Canadians but the problems of government which it discusses have a much wider significance.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

The Spanish Dependencies in South America: an Introduction to the History of their Civilisation. By BERNARD MOSES, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor in the University of California. In two volumes. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1914. Pp. xxvi, 394; ix, 444.)

To anyone interested in the history of America under Spanish rule, and unacquainted with the vernacular literature on the subject, these volumes are very serviceable. Based on an elaborate knowledge of the best printed material, they offer an abundance of data descriptive of a variety of institutions and episodes: some of the former applicable to the whole of Spanish America throughout the colonial régime, most of the latter referring to a particular locality in South America alone. The period primarily singled out for treatment is that between 1550 and 1730. Given the scarcity of books in English, or indeed in any language, which yield a broad survey of these hundred and eighty years, the work is no less welcome to the special student than it is to the general reader.

There are certain characteristics of the treatise, however, to which the student in question may be justified in calling attention. Some of them fall under the caption of error or misstatement that can be corrected in a subsequent edition. Others, and by far the greater number, belong to the realm simply of difference of viewpoint regarding method and content. They involve suggestions for consideration by the author rather than direct criticism of the work itself.

Under the first heading come misprints, repetitions, and other slips. In order to economize space, the pages on which some of these occur may be given, *viz.*: I. xv-xix, 1, 5-7, 10, 12, 15, 28, 71, 72, 94, 122, 157, 173, 189, 191, 192, 207, 210, 217, 223, 231, 233-235, 237, 240, 263-265, 268, 270, 283, 305; II. 1-5, 7, 16, 27, 37, 77, 189, 229, 276, 318, 415, 416, 428.

The second set of characteristics under review brings up at the outset a comparison of the subject-matter with the title. On this point there is room for doubt whether it would not have been better to have indicated that the work is essentially a series of studies on certain phases of Spanish colonization in South America, rather than a comprehensive and co-ordinate account, albeit introductory, of the civilization as such of the Spanish dependencies on that continent. Nearly two-thirds of the material in the first volume deals with the period before 1550. Here and elsewhere descriptions are given of institutions not peculiar to South America, and of occurrences confined very closely to one dependency alone. The net result is an assortment of sidelights, often interesting and valuable in themselves, but not furnishing an orderly narration of events or supplying an organic conception of Spanish colonial civilization as a whole.

In the absence not only of monographs on particular aspects but of any general treatise of a thoroughly scientific nature on Spanish dominion in America, it might appear venturesome to compose a work of this character resting, as it does, on no previous foundation of common knowledge. This circumstance Professor Moses frankly admits in his preface. What the reviewer objects to is not the accomplishment itself, but the designation of it.

Many of the chapters or parts of chapters, furthermore, seem to have sprung from the idea of selecting some noteworthy publication, usually in Spanish, on a specific episode or institution or course of events, and then of clothing the substance of it in English dress. Such a procedure may be advantageous enough when assembling the stuff out of which history is written, but not for the presentation of history itself. Nor is textual evidence forthcoming that the author has ever carried on extensive researches in the Spanish archives. Their stores of manuscript, assuredly, have been drawn upon too little to warrant neglecting them in this connection. The specialist, also, is fairly entitled to an annotated bibliography, and to maps for the tracing of names undiscoverable in a modern atlas. Neither of them is supplied.

Examining, finally, the matter of omission, the reviewer believes that two volumes, aggregating eight hundred pages and devoted titularly to a theme so vast, so complex, and relatively so unknown, as the history of the civilization of the Spanish dependencies in South America, though actually to a limited period therein, ought to have embraced much more than Professor Moses has provided. Art and literature, for example, industrial and commercial processes, and a

variety of social and political phenomena of the greatest significance, have been passed over entirely or afforded but scant explanation. Many things of real importance have been omitted, and some that are not, have been included. The one could have been vouchsafed a measure of description, or an allusion at least with references for further elucidation; the other, reduced in compass, or even left out altogether.

Eclecticism, of course, has its virtues when a compilation of miscellany is the object of a writer. This has not been either the purpose or the outcome of the present work; but it is to be hoped that, when Professor Moses issues a new edition of it, he will be more generous in his system of allotments.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

MINOR NOTICES

L'Hellénisation du Monde Antique: Leçons faites à l'École des Hautes Études Sociales. Par MM. V. Chapot, G. Colin, Alfred Croiset, J. Hatzfeld, A. Jardé, P. Jouguet, G. Leroux, Ad. Reinach, Th. Reinach. (Paris, Félix Alcan, 1914, pp. 391.) What we have here is, archaeologically speaking, a number of blocks of well-cut Greek marble embedded in *opus incertum*. The filling is the work of M. Adolphe Reinach, a younger member of the gifted family which has given to French scholarship the distinguished brothers, Joseph, Salomon, and Theodore. M. Reinach *fils*, who acted as editor of the entire series of lectures included in the volume, was called to the front before the book was published; but his slap-dash style can hardly be attributed to the hurry and exaltation of mobilizing. Long since it was said of him: *c'est un beau garçon, mais il va au galop*. One does not know at which to marvel more, the alertness of his mind and the breadth of his knowledge, or the discursiveness of his thinking and the limitations of his judgment.

His opening lectures on the settlement of the Greeks in the Aegean basin and the historic background of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* contain many suggestive remarks but also many theories that are unconvincing to the initiated and misleading to novices. Among these we rate the Illyrian origin of the Dorians, whom Beloch has recently made Achaeans and Wilamowitz not so long since Cretans. The title of the second lecture, "La Formation des trois Nations Grecques: Éoliens, Ioniens, et Dorien", betrays the unwholesome influence, needlessly revived, of K. O. Müller's *Die Dorier*. We rub our eyes when we read on page 52 that it was only in the second half of the eighth century B. C. that Clazomenae, Teos, Colophon, Ephesus, Priene, and Miletus were founded, and call to mind some of Wilamowitz's "howlers" when we are told on page 108 that the Greeks on their arrival in Sicily rediscovered there their familiar orange trees. This botanical anachronism occurs in his third lecture entitled "L'Hellénisation de l'Occident", which

readers will welcome because of its well-informed survey of early Italian archaeology and ethnology. His other two lectures deal with Alexander and the dismemberment of Alexander's empire. There are some signs here that M. Reinach places too much reliance upon a strong but not invulnerable memory, as, for example, when he makes Antigonus I. take his own life and Antiochus I. fall in battle.

The other eight lectures are all by different scholars. None of the others have the magisterial quality that pertains to M. Alfred Croiset's "*La Transformation Morale de l'Hellénisme d'Alexandre à Auguste*" and M. Theodore Reinach's "*L'Hellénisme en Syrie: la Culture Grecque en Face du Judaïsme*", but they are all good in content and restrained and finished in style.

The general idea of the book is to describe the process by which Hellenism was formed, to trace its spread, explaining why it advanced here and failed to advance there, to note how it modified the life of its various dependencies and how they modified it in turn. The execution is uneven, perhaps inevitably. Insufficient attention, for example, has been paid to the Sophistic movement, which both transformed Hellenism and broadened its circle enormously. Nor has the penetration of Hellenism into Roman Italy been treated adequately. No one could discover from reading this book what Wilamowitz meant when he called the Augustan poetry the bloom of Hellenistic literature.

W. S. FERGUSON.

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Thirty-Second Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A. D. 1185-1186. [The Publications of the Pipe Roll Society, vol. XXXVI.] (London, the Society, 1914, pp. xxxvii, 267.) To this volume, as to its predecessors, Mr. Round has contributed an introduction, calling attention to points of interest in the text. Among these are entries connected with King Henry's expedition against the Lord of Galloway, in which light-armed horse and foot took part; entries relating to the seizure of Hugh de Lacy's lands into the king's hands; entries concerning the revenues from vacant sees and religious houses (over £1000 were paid into the treasury from the "farms" of the manors of the see of Salisbury and the archbishopric of York, alone); and many entries elucidating or elucidated by the recently printed *Rotuli de Dominabus*. Among this last class of entries are references to a *rotulus justiciarum*, appealed to by the sheriff as authority for the *firma* due from "lands in the hands of the crown by wardship or escheat; and references to the restocking of such land, which indicate that the well-known instructions concerning restocking given to the itinerant justices in 1194, were anticipated in 1185. Among the many other interesting matters brought to light in this volume are an hitherto unknown embassy from the Swedish to the English king, and evidence for the import of coniferous timber into England, where it was not grown. The index to the introduction is a welcome innovation.

F. G. D.

The Grey Friars of London; their History with the Register of their Convent and an Appendix of Documents. By Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, M.A. (Aberdeen, the University Press, 1915, pp. viii, 257.) This is the sixth volume in the editions of texts published by the British Society of Franciscan Studies. Its main purpose is to furnish the complete text of the so-called Register of the Grey Friars of London, which now forms part of the Cotton MS. Vitellius F. XII. By way of introduction, Mr. Kingsford gives a scholarly survey of the history of the Grey Friars of London and as an appendix provides a series of documents concerning their convent.

The register which forms the basis of the present volume, was compiled by a friar of the London convent about 1526. It is not, strictly speaking, a "register" but comprises (1) a carefully compiled record of the tombs in the church; (2) a brief account of the foundation of the convent with a summary of deeds referring to the site; (3) materials relating to general Franciscan history. The first of these sections is unquestionably the most interesting and important part of the register. The celebrity of Greyfriars made it a favored place for the burial of persons of rank, of the upper classes of London citizens, and of Italian merchants who died in London. Hence this list of monuments is of great value for the historian and genealogist.

Portions of the register have been printed at different times but its contents are now for the first time published in their entirety. Mr. Kingsford's notes of reference and explanation are really helpful and there is a full and accurate index. But the book is not altogether free from misprints, as, for example, page v, "Vitellius F. IX." for F. XII.; page 181, "Sienna" for Siena; page 141, "Cor dñus" for Cor dñi; page 179, "Taulicis" for Tavileis. A few small errors of detail are also to be found in the notes, as, for instance, page 182, where John of Alvernia is described as "Bishop of Firmo". This friar was born at Fermo but was not a bishop. A lack of uniformity is noticeable as regards the translation of names and places. Thus, "Fratres Minores" is sometimes rendered "Friars Minors" and elsewhere "Friars Minor". The latter is, of course, the more usual and recognized English form. The careful restoration of the ground plan of Greyfriars and the reproduction in facsimile of the seal of the London convent and of the press-mark of its library enhance the merits of the volume.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

Pre-Reformation Scholars in Scotland in the XVIth Century: their Writings and their Public Services, with a Bibliography and a List of Graduates from 1500 to 1560. By W. Forbes Leith, S.J. (Glasgow, James MacLehose and Sons, 1915, pp. vi, 155.) In the work under review, the author seeks to rebut the wholesale charge of ignorance which, among other accusations of incompetence, is so frequently made against the pre-Reformation church in Scotland; and he sets forth the familiar

counter-thesis that the church, while sound in the main, and even brilliant intellectually, suffered, during a troublous period of Scottish history, from the violent intrusion, largely under lay influence, of a number of black sheep. His contention is set forth in a brief introduction of twenty-one pages, and is supported by a section of seventy-five pages, giving a catalogue of about seventy writers of the early sixteenth century with their works, brief notices of the more important being inserted. The concluding fifty-five pages of the book are occupied with a list of graduates (1500-1560 A. D.) and a few additional notes.

The author deserves commendation for the labor expended on the gathering of a mass of bibliographic material, but, as the limits of this notice forbid following him in detail through this useful portion of his work, we must confine our criticism to the over-sanguine view of pre-Reformation learning adopted in his introduction. His evidence, while good so far as it goes, is one-sided—a mass of other material, which would have lengthened his introduction considerably and made his thesis harder to prove, is ignored. To take only one example—statutes of the church and synodal constitutions of the period dealt with, make damaging admissions as to the state of current clerical scholarship, and show that even the fathers of the Church in provincial council assembled were capable of bad lapses in theological learning. (Cf. Patrick's *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, Introduction, pp. lxxxi*, and §§ 180*, 181*, 188-194, 203*, 219, 223, 224, 240-242, 253-254*, 258, 274-279, especially those marked *.) Some of the author's own extracts tell rather against him (cf. p. 12, Major; p. 47, Hay; p. 49, Wilson; p. 53, Twapenny Faith); and to call Bellenden's Boëce a "free translation" is describing it mildly. There are misprints in the foot-notes at pages 1, 19, 148.

Some of these objections might have been met in advance by lengthening the introduction to include ignored or suppressed evidence; but even if the author's contention were right, how does he explain the catastrophe of 1560? The book is well illustrated.

JOHN DALL.

Les Rabodanges. Par R. de Brébisson. (La Chapelle-Montligeon, privately printed, 1914, pp. viii, 401.) The family of Rabodanges originated in Artois but came into Normandy in the sixteenth century. The volume before us, prepared with great scholarship and care, and handsomely printed, with beautiful illustrations, chiefly views of châteaux, devotes two brief introductory chapters to the history of the family before its entrance upon its Norman estates, but is mainly devoted to the conjoined history of the family and estates from the time that the first Louis de Rabodanges became *bailly* of Alençon in 1549. The plan of the book is that of a documentary history. The author has with extraordinary industry ransacked Parisian and provincial libraries and archives for documents relating to the family and their estates, has added

to them many documents in private possession, and has given their texts, in great numbers, with a modicum of comment. The château of Rabodanges now existing, which for somewhat more than thirty years has been in American hands, was built by Louis III. de Rabodanges, *gentil-homme ordinaire* of the chamber of Louis XIV., who in 1649 made him Marquis de Rabodanges. Several members of the family attained some distinction in military service, though none reached the highest positions. The last of the family, Jean Henri, comte de Rabodanges, died in 1792. The volume contains interesting pages respecting the pious foundations made by the family, the legend of Marie de Clèves, and the local events of the Revolution.

Germany since 1740. By George Madison Priest, Princeton University. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1915, pp. xvi, 198.) From one point of view the above book is very well done indeed; from another it is a monstrosity. The facts are almost all correct, well chosen, and well stated. The author has struggled with an immense mass of material and shaken down a smooth narrative. I have noticed but few omissions, the most serious being that there is little or no reference to the enormous activity of the German cities as carriers on of industrial enterprises—a step towards municipal socialism that is extremely interesting and important. Altogether the cities are comparatively neglected in the book, though it is there that the life of the people is pulsating most strongly.

Of positive errors I will mention only two (there are a few other insignificant inaccuracies), both relating to political parties. Since February 8, 1912, it can no longer be said of the "Centre" that "in crises the final dictator of its actions is the Pope in Rome". On that day the long struggle between the Berlin or papal direction and the Cologne or national direction (led by Bachem) culminated in the victory of the latter and in the unanimous declaration both in the Reichstag and in the state diets that the Centre was a "political, non-confessional party". The pope's dictation of the party's policy had directly been brought into the question.

Nor can it be said (unless absolute secession is meant) that the socialist party "has never broken into groups". The Marxists and the Revisionists form two very distinct groups, it seems to me, and it is most interesting to watch out and see which direction will eventually triumph. The forces are now about evenly divided.

My "monstrosity" charge is directed not against the author but against the fashion, if I may so call it, of making "an introduction" to history by galvanizing a summary into a lively narrative. I acknowledge that teachers seem to demand such treatment.

Here in the space of 184 small pages Mr. Priest disposes of almost exactly that number of years, placing very broad limits, too, for at times he takes in the whole of European history and includes German

literature, philosophy, natural science, religious life, art, and even music. Such a summary is not an "introduction"; it takes a thoroughly trained mind to follow it with any interest. As far as the wars are concerned it would have been better to discuss merely their importance and their results, relegating the single battles to foot-notes. Nothing is gained by intentional indefiniteness designed to lighten the narrative of its ballast of names, as when some well-known battle is disposed of as a "victory" or when Gambetta is spoken of merely as a "member of the new French government" escaping from Paris in a balloon. But I repeat that, considering the kind of book Mr. Priest intended to, or was asked to, write, he has done his work very well.

Prisoners of War in Britain, 1756-1815: a Record of their Lives, their Romance and their Sufferings. By Francis Abell. (London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1914, pp. viii, 464.) The author tells us that he was moved to write this book by a hope that he "might be able to vindicate" his country "against the charge . . . that she treated the prisoners of war in her custody with exceptional inhumanity", and a "desire to rescue from oblivion a not unimportant and most interesting chapter of our national history". The book appeared at a most opportune time, when the question of the manner in which prisoners of war ought to be treated was a point in dispute among the nations at war, and it ought to be of general interest. The manner in which the author has performed his task, however, makes his book a disappointment to readers of all classes.

Mr. Abell has collected many scraps of information concerning the conditions of life among and the treatment accorded to the prisoners of war in Great Britain in the period 1760-1815. His information relates to prisoners who were confined on the prison-ships or "hulks" as well as to those on shore, whether in the various prisons or on parole. But instead of using this information, which he has been at much pains to collect, to establish general conclusions in answer to the questions that led him to undertake the inquiry or others which his work might have suggested, the author has chosen to retail his notes in the form of a sort of chronicle of the happenings among the prisoners and the officers who had them in charge. After two general chapters, written in the same style as the rest of the book, on International Recriminations and the Exchange of Prisoners, he has three chapters on "Life in the Hulks", then chapters in turn on each of the larger prisons ashore, and a single chapter on some of the minor prisons. Chapters follow on the parole life of the prisoners in the several parts of the kingdom, on Escape Agents and Escapers, Complaints of Prisoners, and similar topics. A chapter each is allotted to two prisoners, who are termed "famous escapers". Three chapters are given to Sundry Notes on Parole Life and Prison-Ship Sundries. Under these captions the author has strung together notes referring to minor details of prison

life which "could not be conveniently dealt with" in the other chapters. Finally, there is a chapter entitled *Variorum* in which an important part of the information which the author ought to have given at greater length in his book is sandwiched, under the title *Some Statistics*, between the other two parts of the chapter, *Some Distinguished Prisoners of War* and *Epitaphs of Prisoners*.

Aside from the general character of the narrative and the failure of the author to organize his material according to any definite plan or to state clearly his conclusions, the book is wanting in any of the earmarks of scholarship, such as foot-notes or other means of identifying and criticizing the sources from which information has been obtained. Finally, that portion of the book which is the composition of the author, and not mere quotations and abstracts of the authorities from which he has gleaned his information, is written in a style that is crude, indirect, and not always clear.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

Early Methodist Philanthropy. By Eric McCoy North. (New York and Cincinnati, the Methodist Book Concern, 1914, pp. viii, 181.) Early Methodism has been admirably described as "a rapture and an organization". The immediate aim of the movement was the "souls" of men; one of the avenues of approach was concern for the welfare of their "bodies". In a spiritual experience lay the rapture; in the administration of charity lay the organization. Of the religious side of the movement much has been said and well said; to its philanthropic activities and organization less attention has been given. It is to supply this lack that Mr. North offers this comprehensive and suggestive study. For it is hardly a treatise, and an enlargement is hinted at.

It is a commonplace of religious history that Wesley interpreted religion "in terms of life". But it is not so familiar that that interpretation was illustrated and enforced by a series of philanthropic enterprises and a variety of benevolent institutions almost without parallel in the history of religion. Mr. Wesley was not a social reformer in our sense of the term; he did not deal formally or scientifically with the issues of poverty or public health or ignorance; he dealt by personal and private initiative with poor, sick, and ignorant people. His social philosophy was very simple. To him the root of social evil was sin; the one efficient and sufficient remedy was the life of the Spirit which had its beginning in "conversion". Nevertheless, until the consummation of the Kingdom had been achieved it was necessary for disciples to bear one another's burdens and to minister as opportunity appeared or need demanded.

Like every other genius Mr. Wesley was a splendid borrower. Wherever he found a method of Christian or humanitarian work likely to be of service he adopted and adapted it. But if there was nothing novel about the method there was an impressive originality about the

motive and spirit in which the method was exercised. For Mr. Wesley informed every social activity with the distinctively religious emphasis which never for a moment overlooked the necessity of the "new birth" as prerequisite to the better social order. As Mr. North shows and argues, "The movement was missionary from the start and it was from just this atmosphere of spiritual energy that the philanthropy gained its fervent, persistent quality. In this atmosphere also benevolent motives were multiplied."

Mr. North commends his study by the manifest thoroughness of his preparation for it. His list of authorities and his use of them, as shown in his citations and inferences, are a tribute to his industry, scholarship, and breadth of view. He writes sympathetically but judiciously, and, while fully recognizing the exalted genius of Mr. Wesley, he does equal justice to Mr. Wesley's predecessors and contemporaries without whom the Wesleyan movement could not have been. The study is welcome for itself and all the more welcome as the promise of a larger and fuller treatise on a significant and epoch-marking humanitarian movement.

CHARLES M. STUART.

St. Privat: German Sources. Translations by Harry Bell, M.S.E., United States Army. (Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, Staff College Press, 1914, pp. 498.) Military students have been overworked during the last twenty years, and perhaps they will feel something of a shock, when they find this new book on St. Privat, containing much new matter that has not heretofore been available in the English language. Those, however, who do not regard it as ancient history are provided by the Staff College with a book of 498 pages, made up of an approved collection of the best information derived from German sources. This we are informed is the policy in aiding to the "intensive study" of modern wars. Moreover there is an appendix enumerating a well-selected list of books in other languages which are more accessible to our officers than the German. Thus the curious searcher after facts is provided with the best advice as to the material on which to base his independent judgment.

Of course we could not fail to find the familiar effort to build up certain reputations and to pull others down, so common and so discouraging in this particular class of military literature. This is quite prominent in the long argument of the relatively small points at issue between the Saxons and the Prussian Guards. Then there are war diaries, official accounts, biographical memoirs, and professional discussions, published during more than forty years, with some of the repetition that cannot be avoided in independent accounts of the same event.

Of course a more popular method would be to seek at once the companionship of the destructive critics such as Maude the Englishman,

Rousset the Frenchman, and Hoenig the German, some of whom have shed the light of genius upon that dark day. Filled with the wisdom that comes after great events they have shown the mistakes in Moltke's strategy, in Frederick Charles's tactics, in cavalry reconnaissance, in artillery preparation, and in infantry attack. Yet have they not failed to do homage to the initiative of the Saxon princes and to the valor of the Prussian Guards. And in doing this they have saved some of us a great deal of time in this world of many books.

After all the judgment of the student will probably be that the battle was well won in the way that it was won.

EBEN SWIFT.

An Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America for the Years 1757, 1758, 1759, and 1760. By Captain John Knox. Edited with Introduction, Appendix, and Index by Arthur G. Doughty. Volume II. [Publications of the Champlain Society, IX.] (Toronto, the Champlain Society, 1914, pp. xi, 617.) The second volume of Knox's *Journal* covers some thirteen months from August, 1759, to September, 1760. It begins on the morrow of the British repulse from the Beauport lines and ends with the capitulation of Montreal, including the final and most dramatic scenes in the conquest of Canada. Supplemented by notes which correct occasional small inaccuracies, the book is an invaluable chronicle of this *annus mirabilis*, written by a transparently honest gentleman, with an observant kindly eye for men, things, and landscapes. The chief blemish in it, already noted in the review of the first volume, is the absence of criticism, due to the writer's position and circumstances. Thus, Knox eulogizes Amherst in extravagant terms, as having exhibited "such eminent excellencies, in the art of War, as must excite the astonishment and admiration of all mankind"; whereas Amherst, if sure, was exceedingly slow, and, as the editor points out, he never seems to have appreciated the difficulties at Quebec. The account of Murray's defense of Quebec and of his subsequent advance on Montreal leaves, on the other hand, the impression of a man who was a soldier of high order, as he certainly was an excellent governor. He lost the battle of Sillery or Sainte Foy, and severe criticism of his rashness by Sergeant John Johnson of the 58th Regiment will be found in the note on page 452; while Parkman, in the same connection, writes of him as "young in years and younger still in impulse". But in his frank, soldierly letter to his brother (p. 395, note) Murray makes out a good case for himself with regard to the fight, and in general his despatches to Amherst and Pitt are the letters of a man who had gauged a difficult situation and was equal to it.

Dr. Doughty has greatly added to the book by including these and other documents in his notes as well as by the notes themselves. Thus the notes on pages 47-48 and 209 show conclusively that to Wolfe himself and to no one else was due the merit of the successful landing

at the Foulon, that he finally carried out a plan which he had long had in his mind. Special value, as is pointed out in the editor's preface to the first volume, attaches to Knox's record of the winter siege and defense of Quebec. The battle of the Plains and the surrender of the city which followed, seemed at the time, as it seems still to those who know little of the history, to have ended the chapter. Murray was nearer the truth when he wrote to Amherst, "The fact is we were surprised into a victory which cost the conquered very little indeed" (p. 439, note). That Quebec was held through the winter was due to Murray's own firm leadership and to Tommy Atkins who was at his very best. Ill clothed, unpaid, the government being even reduced to borrowing money from the soldiers, notably Fraser's thrifty Highlanders, punished for misconduct by death or one thousand lashes, with their strength halved by scurvy, none the less the soldiers, writes Knox, "contentedly and cheerfully submit to the necessity of the times, exerting all the man, and the good soldier, upon every occasion". When worsted at the battle of Sainte Foy and ordered to fall back, "growing impatient, some of them cried out, 'Damn it, what is falling back but retreating'".

C. P. LUCAS.

Nathan Hale, 1776: Biography and Memorials. By Henry Phelps Johnston, Professor of History in the College of New York. Revised and enlarged edition. (New Haven, Yale University Press, London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1914, pp. x, 296.) This revised and enlarged edition of the biography and memorials of Nathan Hale contains, besides a fairly critical account of the life and martyrdom of its hero, some sixty letters and a diary which are of value to any student of the Revolution. The diary kept by Hale contains the melancholy record, so common in all such contemporary accounts, of the wretched inefficiency of the "armed citizenry", the much lauded "embattled farmers", whose sole commendation was that they exhibited on occasion a reckless bravery, but whose constant weakness was a lack of discipline and of all knowledge of war. Hale himself, a young man of intelligence, character, and high sense of responsibility, was much alarmed by the prevalent insubordination. When in an emergency he undertook the repugnant and hateful office of a spy, he reasoned, we are told, that "every kind of service necessary to the public good becomes honorable by being necessary". Though unfit for the undertaking, too frank and too open for deceit and evasion, he did it because "the exigencies of my country demand a peculiar service". Detected and captured, he made a full confession, and Sir William Howe, without the form of a trial, gave orders for his execution the following morning. A British officer in whose marquee he spent his last hour records that his dying words were, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country." This tradition is a noble one to have in-

woven with our country's history. Probably no great nation is lacking in such a tradition. In truth Nathan Hale was one of those fortunate individuals in history, whose claim to fame was that a brave deed, common enough in the annals of mankind, and oft repeated in any great war, became through lucky chance the symbolic one for all noble actions of that type. Tradition took hold upon it, and surrounded it with a sentimental glamor, which brightened more and more as imagination bodied forth this virtue and gave to an heroic quality a local habitation and a name. Hale's personal charm, as in the case of Major André, greatly aided the magic of this process. In the tradition of Paul Revere a poet's pen gave distinction to a bold ride not unlike a hundred others in those romantic days before the telephone and the wireless telegraph had unhorsed the dashing couriers of war. In the case of Nathan Hale social position helped to seize and hold contemporary interest. He came of a family whose character and worth were attested by the names of a well-known divine, an eminent judge, a humanitarian of distinction, and others whose qualities and graces were such as to be handed down to later generations at least in local traditions. That Hale's historical place is secure whether owing to good fortune or not, seems established by the fact that ten books and some sixteen poems or dramas have been written about him, and that notices more or less extended are found in fifty-three other books, while twenty-six magazine articles and some forty newspaper sketches have been discovered by the assiduous author and editor of this volume.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

The Indian Stream Republic and Luther Parker. By Grant Showerman, Ph.D., Professor of Latin Literature, University of Wisconsin. [Collections of the New Hampshire Historical Society, vol. XI.] (Concord, N. H., the Society, 1915, pp. vi, 272.) This first volume of *Collections* issued by the society since 1893 is a welcome example of such publication of original material as justifies the existence of historical societies. The Indian Stream Republic occupied disputed territory claimed by England and the United States, 1783-1842, between the Connecticut River and lakes on the east and the present northwestern boundary of New Hampshire. It is almost identical with the present township of Pittsborough. Through its eastern portion, Francis Parkman passed in 1842 when a Harvard sophomore, on a trip described in "Exploring the Magalloway", published in *Harper's Magazine*, XXIX. 735 (1864).

For forty years Indian Stream governed itself. Its remarkable constitution of 1832 proclaimed it a "sovereign state". It incorporated practically verbatim a large portion of the New Hampshire constitution's bill of rights, omitting those relating to support of religion, conscientious scruples against war, liberty of the press, separation of executive, legislative, and judicial departments, jury trial in civil cases,

standing army, and martial law. The most significant additions are the right of the majority to control the minority and "the right of controlling those vicious members of society who invade the rights of others". The general assembly of all adult males had no right of initiative, this being reserved to the council elected by the assembly. "The Indian Stream War" with Canada (1835) hastened the acceptance of New Hampshire's jurisdiction in 1836.

The book includes land and assembly records, the report of the Indian Stream Commissioners, and a journal of Luther Parker's daughter Ellen, giving interesting details of western pioneer life, subsequent to Parker's removal to Wisconsin in 1836. The great mass of details might have been occasionally lightened by the substitution of some interpretation, notably in the case of the constitution; but the work was worth doing, has been well done, and possesses some degree of unity through its picture of pioneer life east and west.

HERBERT DARLING FOSTER.

Robert Fulton. By Alice Crary Sutcliffe. [True Stories of Great Americans.] (New York, Macmillan Company, 1915, pp. xi, 195.) The pleasure of writing the life of an ancestor whose fame has made his name immortal must be very great to an author possessed of real literary skill, and Mrs. Sutcliffe has given us a life of Fulton which has great merit. It is written for young people but will give most adults a fund of information about the great inventor and engineer which they could hardly find elsewhere in the same compass. The story of Fulton's career is very complete in a general way, although the limited space obviously shuts out details of the less important periods of his life. It is a great pleasure to note that Mrs. Sutcliffe has proved a fair and impartial biographer. She gives at considerable length an account of the work done by the other early inventors of steamboats, and recognizes that the peculiar merit of Fulton was the design of the steamboat on scientific principles so as to make it a commercial success.

The account of his invention of submarine torpedo warfare is adequate, and properly calls attention to the fact that Fulton had done all that was possible in this sphere with the motive power available.

In view of the fact that this book is for young people, Mrs. Sutcliffe deserves special commendation for emphasizing, again and again, that Fulton's success and fame are due not alone to his genius but mainly to hard work, assiduous care of details, and tenacity of purpose that surmounted all discouragements. This is true of all great inventors, but usually one hears only of the success and little or nothing of the hard work and persistence.

The style of the book is attractive and we can commend it as admirably fulfilling its aim of giving the true story of the life of one of America's greatest sons, and also of teaching some very useful lessons and inculcating high ideals in the young people for whom it is written.

Millard Fillmore: Constructive Statesman, Defender of the Constitution, President of the United States. By William Elliot Griffis, D.D., L.H.D. (Ithaca, N. Y., Andrus and Church, 1915, pp. ix, 159.) Dr. Griffis has written an interesting little book in the effort to show that Millard Fillmore, "far from being the colorless man in American politics which rivals and enemies, the ignorant and copyists have made him", was "not the least in a line of rulers, which for ethical purity, high character and signal abilities, knows no superior in the world's long history". Filled with lively comments, pungent allusions to events contemporary and recent, picturesque descriptions of Congressional and social life in the fifties, the volume shows a refreshing unconventionality in its eulogy of the Unionist statesman, at the expense of abolitionists and extremists. But although Dr. Griffis has done his best, he has found the task of enlivening Fillmore's honorable record too much for even his vigorous pen. In spite of every effort Fillmore remains, as Dr. Griffis honestly admits, "rigidly conservative", "above all cautious", "tranquil", "methodical", of "imperturbable temper", and "correct habits". "He steered", declares the author, "according to the compass of the Constitution. To Millard Fillmore, this was as the finger of God pointing the way." Not even Dr. Griffis's vivacity can alter the essential commonplaceness of the respectable, moderate President. The only direct claim for Fillmore's leadership is made regarding the foreign policy of his administration, which is declared to be "fully equal . . . to Washington's in prudence, or to Grant's or Roosevelt's in firmness, or to Taft's or Wilson's in wisdom". No evidence is brought forward, however, to transfer from Webster to Fillmore the honor hitherto credited to the Secretary of State in the Huelsemann, Kossuth, and Lopez affairs, nor, for that matter, is there any full consideration of the relations of Webster, Fillmore, and the party leaders in the nominating convention of 1852. For any new light on the history of the Fillmore administration the book will be consulted in vain. Doubtless Dr. Griffis merely intended to touch on the high points and produce a lively narrative. This he has certainly succeeded in accomplishing.

THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

Ulysses S. Grant. By Franklin Spencer Edmonds. [American Crisis Biographies.] (Philadelphia, George W. Jacobs and Company, 1915, pp. 376.) This brief popular sketch of the life of General Grant is based upon secondary materials, of which a short bibliographical list is appended to the volume. There are three documentary appendices, containing, respectively, the letters interchanged between Grant and Sherman, in March, 1864, upon the occasion of the nomination of Grant as lieutenant-general; the orders of May 2, 1864, to the Army of the Potomac, before the general advance of the next few days; and the letters exchanged by Grant and Lee in regard to the surrender at

Appomattox. The book is sufficiently indexed. The only illustration is the frontispiece, taken from a photograph of Grant by Gutekunst.

Mr. Edmonds writes in an easy style, and handles his subject with sympathy, but without excessive hero-worship. As would be expected, the most extensive and the best-executed part of the book is that devoted to the description of Grant's military career. This gives an excellent bird's-eye view of Grant's progress through all his commands. The need for compression results, however, in some omissions; for example, in that of any account of Grant's nagging of Thomas at Nashville. Grant's personal characteristics are portrayed with frankness, and both the good points of honesty and resoluteness, and the failings as to excessive drinking and failure to control political friends are brought out. Less satisfactory is the treatment of general political history. The summary of the causes of the Mexican War, for example, is hardly adequate, and the single chapter devoted to the eight years of Grant's presidency does not afford a satisfactory analysis of Grant's political conduct in that office.

As a whole, however, the book compares favorably with the best of those in the series in which it is included—the *American Crisis Biographies*.

Growth of American State Constitutions from 1776 to the End of the Year 1914. By James Quayle Dealey, Ph.D., Professor of Social and Political Science, Brown University. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1915, pp. viii, 308.) In the preface of this book Mr. Dealey expresses the hope that it may serve as a text for the study of state constitutions and government in our colleges, and be of service to citizens and members of state legislatures and constitutional conventions who wish to understand our state political institutions. The book falls readily into three parts: (1) the History of State Constitutions (chs. I.-VIII.), (2) Provisions of existing State Constitutions (chs. IX.-XIX.), and (3) the Trend of State Constitutions (chs. XX.-XXII.). Part II. is a revision of the author's well-known study of constitutions which appeared in the *Annals* as a supplement for March, 1907. It is too well and favorably known to need comment here. All students of state government will welcome this revision.

The first and third parts are not so satisfying. The insistence of the author in his first chapter upon the overwhelming importance of the state governments seems in this day to be hardly justified. To describe the American system as "not an empire but a federation of republics" is a curious statement of our constitutional doctrine.

Part I. is not so much a contribution to an understanding of our constitutional development, as a mere description of changes in machinery. What was behind these constitutional changes? The author realizes the problem confronting him, for he says on page 51 that it would be tedious and confusing to enumerate in any detail the substance

of the new and revised constitutions "and the advantages gained by it are not obvious". He then proceeds, however, to give this detail without much discussion as to its significance. That "Ohio in 1873-4 held a convention whose constitution when submitted was rejected at the polls" (p. 82) is certainly not important enough for inclusion unless what was submitted is of interest or the reasons for rejection noteworthy. A catalogue of revision and amendment must be illumined and interpreted if it is to "arouse interest in our local institutions". Else it is merely a manual and not a study in the growth of American state constitutions.

According to the author the "really fundamental trend of change" in the last thirty years has been from a dominant legislature to a dominant electorate working through the convention. But an analysis of the author's own figures (p. 89) convinces the reader of exactly the opposite conclusion.

The last two chapters are based upon the proposals which have recently been made in many quarters for the reorganization of state government. Curiously, the author suggests a small, well-paid legislative body of capable men fired with "civic dignity", after he has concluded that legislatures exercise only a "small residue of petty powers" and that "a convention meeting periodically, and well supervised administrative departments with ordinance powers, might well perform all legislative functions with entire satisfaction" (p. 267). Why not then forego a legislature altogether? Such is the feeling produced by the author's argument.

The administrative proposals of the author seem hasty and confusing, but limitation of space forbids their consideration in this review.

C. A. DYKSTRA.

The Financial History of New York State from 1789 to 1912. By Don C. Sowers, Professor of Municipalities and Public Accounting, University of Oregon. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, vol. LVII., no. 2, whole no. 140.] (New York, Columbia University, 1914, pp. 346.) This is the thirteenth of a series of monographs on the financial history of the American commonwealths which has been written under the auspices of the Department of Economics and Sociology of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. The other states thus far covered are California, Connecticut, Maryland, Ohio, Oregon, Vermont, and Wisconsin, the histories of which have been published; and Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Montana, and North Dakota, which are still unpublished. Professor Sowers's monograph deals with the most important state in the list, and in bulk is one of the most ambitious. It is therefore with regret that the reviewer records his conclusion that the author has not lived up to his opportunity.

According to Webster, history is "a systematic written account of

events . . . and usually connected with a philosophical explanation of their causes". The present study is not lacking in philosophical explanations, but it is not a systematic account of events. There are great gaps in the narrative. For instance, in the chapter on Public Lands, there is nothing on the period from 1833 to 1880; the chapter on Banking stops with 1866; the chapter on Expenditures skips decades at a time; the chapter on Management of Funds jumps from 1831 to 1842, and from 1846 to 1860, etc.

The book has suffered severely from its too ambitious character; unable to investigate the whole field at first-hand the author has based his earlier chapters largely upon the work of others. The chapter on Banking is based upon Chaddock's *History of the Safety Fund Banking in New York, 1829 to 1866*, and makes no attempt to continue the narrative beyond 1866; the account of Internal Improvements is based upon the *History of New York Canals*, published by the state in 1905; chapter VII. on Revenues draws largely from Schwab's *History of the General Property Tax*. On the other hand, the last four chapters contain the author's own contribution to the financial history of the state. These deal respectively with Revenues (other than the general property tax), Expenditures, Management of Funds, and State Funds. If the author had confined himself to these subjects and given us a clear account of the financial policy of the state such as Professor Bullock has published in his *Financial Policy of Massachusetts*, or an intensive study of the sources of revenue, like Haig's *History of the General Property Tax in Illinois*, the result would have been more satisfactory.

The last two chapters, together with the appendixes, constitute a really valuable account of the finances of New York, sketchy though it is. It is unfortunate that the author did not refer in the text itself to the tables in the appendixes, as they are carefully and thoroughly made and deserve a place in the body of the book. Only one who has made similar use of the hopelessly confused state financial reports can realize the labor involved in the compilation of these tables. Appendix IV. contains a table of the state debt from 1816 to 1912, but the subject is not discussed in the text, though public indebtedness should be included in a complete financial history of the state. There are some mistakes of fact and not a few typographical errors, but in view of what has been said it will not be necessary to particularize these.

E. L. BOGART.

Chronicles of the Cape Fear River: being Some Account of Historic Events on the Cape Fear River. By James Sprunt. With a preface by S. A. Ashe. (Raleigh, N. C., Edwards and Broughton Printing Company, 1914, pp. 594.) The author of this valuable work, for five years (1907-1912) German consul for North Carolina, since 1884 British vice-consul at Wilmington, and senior partner of the great

cotton export house of Alexander Sprunt and Son, has devoted much time in the course of a life charged with industrial activities to the prosecution and patronage of historical research. The *James Sprunt Historical Monographs*, continued as the *James Sprunt Historical Publications*, and issued by the University of North Carolina, in themselves constitute conspicuous incentive to historical investigation. The volume, *Tales and Traditions of the Lower Cape Fear*, the important historical monograph, *Tales of the Blockade Runners*, and fanciful tales of the sea, of which *What Ship is That?* is a characteristic example, exhibit the natural trend of the historical investigations of one who served as purser on the steamer *Lilian* and later on the steamer *Susan Bierne*, under the daring Confederate blockade runners, J. N. and E. Maffitt.

The present volume consecutively chronicles, in a long series of brief chapters, the principal historic events of a region in eastern North Carolina memorialized in the writings of the Davises, Hooper, McRee, Waddell, Alderman, Ashe, Meares (Mrs. K. deR.), Connor, and McKoy; and incidentally furnishes a compact catalogue of the industrial resources of that region. The author has included extensive excerpts from, and abstracts of, the writings of others, notably of Joseph Jefferson, S. A. Ashe, J. G. Burr, Iredell Meares, W. B. McKoy, G. J. McRee, John Wilkinson, J. H. Hill, M. P. Usina, J. A. Holmes, George Davis, Thomas E. Taylor, J. L. Cantwell, David MacRae, Mrs. W. M. Parsley, J. J. Blair, and A. M. Waddell. Notable for the charm of personal reminiscence and the wealth of historical detail are the chapters: Cape Fear Pilots, Blockade Running, and Confederate Heroes. In the important chapter, Financial Estimates of Blockade Running, the author, whose personal career and experience as financier give exceptional weight to his testimony, after elaborate analysis, hazards the estimate that "the blockade running traffic during the war, including the cost of the ships, amounted to about one hundred and fifty millions of dollars, gold standard". The paramount importance of this traffic to the Confederate government is shown in the intercepted despatch from General Lee to Col. Lamb, at Fort Fisher, in the course of the naval operations against that bulwark of the blockade runners: "If Fort Fisher falls, I shall have to evacuate Richmond." Chapters descriptive of the liberal culture, gracious social life, and lavish hospitality of the people of this famous region, are Plantations on the Northeast River, by the late Dr. John Hampden Hill, and the Thalian Association, abstracted from the monograph of the distinguished antiquarian, the late Col. James G. Burr. The elaborate personal researches of the author, the delightful style of the narrative, the wealth of information, the included chapters by skilled historical investigators, the solid economic substructure—all co-operate to make of this book the most important work yet brought out in North Carolina dealing with a city (Wilmington) and its environs. Conspicuous for its absence is any detailed

account of the "Revolution of 1898", the author, no doubt wisely at this date, contenting himself with a brief abstract from the Memoirs of Col. A. M. Waddell. The book is stoutly bound and clearly printed on thick paper of unusually good quality. The index of five and a half pages is entirely inadequate for a work of this size and importance.

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON.

Collections of the State Historical Society of North Dakota. Volume IV. (Bismarck, 1915, pp. 944) contains an unusual number of sketches designed to illustrate early territorial history. The history of McKenzie County portrays vividly the ranching life of the Bad Lands and the lawlessness of border communities. The Bohemian immigration to the state is described and considerable material is appended to the sketch regarding Bohemian organizations in the Northwest. The first Dunker colony is described in considerable detail with many sketches of the early pioneers. The longest local study is the history of the early Presbyterian Church by one of the pioneer preachers of the time. Besides these sketches, the territorial census of 1885 is given complete for seventeen of the early counties, and contains a wealth of local material covering a considerable range of interest. Two of the papers published in this volume concern matters entirely outside state history. The location and survey of the northern international boundary line between the Lake of the Woods and the Rocky Mountains is discussed in an interesting fashion and much new material is made available to the student of history. This is true also of the historical sketch of Hudson's Bay and the Company and the Red River trade, to which are appended reprints of many interesting documents bearing on the subject—petitions, letters, memorials, resolutions, etc. A very interesting reprint is Judge Coltman's *Summary of Evidence in the Controversy between the Hudson's Bay Company and the North West Company*. For the student of history in the section west of the Great Lakes the fur-trade war between these two great companies is of first-rate importance and this document throws much light on the facts of that long and bitter struggle. The Minutes of the Council of the Northern Department of Rupert's Land, 1830-1843, is a document printed here for the first time in this country, though lately printed also by the Canadian Archives, and gives in complete detail, year by year, the votes, business arrangements, and distribution of officers and men by this body representing the Hudson's Bay Company of London. This mass of official transactions throws a flood of light upon the inner workings of this great trading corporation and supplies exact information upon many disputed points. It is to be hoped that the publication of this portion of the Minutes of Council will result, without duplication, in bringing into print the proceedings covering the earlier and later years of the Hudson's Bay Company's history.

As in other volumes there is given here a carefully edited Indian

legend. In this case the legend is one belonging to the Hidatsa tribe and describes the origin and later life of the mythological patron of that tribe.

The Mining Advance into the Inland Empire: a Comparative Study of the Beginnings of the Mining Industry in Idaho and Montana, Eastern Washington and Oregon, and the Southern Interior of British Columbia, and the Institutions and Laws based upon that Industry. By William J. Trimble, Professor of History and Social Science, North Dakota Agricultural College. [Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, no. 638, History Series, vol. III., no. 2.] (Madison, the University, 1914, pp. 254.) This account of the occupation of the gold-bearing placer regions of the upper Fraser, Columbia, and Missouri rivers in the decade following 1855 exhibits three salient and dominating ideas of the author. This movement of population is viewed as "part of the formation and advance of an *eastward moving frontier*". The American frontier had in the decade from 1840 to 1850 leaped from the banks of the Missouri to the valleys of the Willamette and Sacramento. Now it recoiled eastward and met half-way the old frontier still advancing westward. Secondly, the writer is concerned in tracing the rise of mining camps, with many diverse elements of population suddenly congregated, into orderly, well-organized communities. His leading idea, however, has to do with the contrast between the courses of development of those under British jurisdiction and those under American authorities.

Professor Trimble's narrative is a remarkably clear, well-ordered, and comprehensive handling of a large and difficult subject. The physiographical features of the wilderness of the "inland empire", the Indian tribes in possession, and the sources of the population that took part in the "rushes" are graphically outlined. The vicissitudes of trial and hardship in getting to the remote locations of the different discoveries with supplies, and experiences of privation and danger in the early stages of the development of each camp, are well worked out and told largely in the language of reliable contemporary accounts of participants. Following a realistic survey of the salient features of the rushes to the different localities of gold discovery, the economic, social, and political, or law and order aspects, of these "mining advances" are brought out.

The fact that these mining communities were about equally divided between British and American jurisdiction, half situated north of the 49th parallel and half south of that line, afforded excellent opportunity to Dr. Trimble to give his history the quality of a record of social experiment and verification. He establishes convincingly that the physiography of these British and American localities and the constituent elements of the population of the respective groups of mining camps north and south of the Line were not divergent enough to account for

the contrasting types of life and institutions developed in them. In other words, the principle of economic determinism or that of the controlling sway of the self-maintenance *mores* does not find confirmation in the early history of the "inland empire". Moreover, the virtue and efficiency of the British tradition of law and administration quite outshine what is exhibited of social control on the American side. Constituted authorities are equal to the emergencies with one, while vigilance committees and lynch law have to function with the other to secure safety for life and property.

A carefully arranged bibliography of sources used is given. A few lapses in proof-reading occur that need attention when a second edition is issued.

F. G. YOUNG.

Canada and its Provinces: a History of the Canadian People and their Institutions, by a Hundred Associates. Edited by Adam Shortt and Arthur G. Doughty. (Toronto, Publishers Association of Canada, 1914, 23 vols.) This is the most important work on Canadian history which has ever been produced. The plan is co-operative. Its general conduct has been under the skillful hands of Dr. Shortt, formerly of Queen's University, now Civil Service commissioner, and of Dr. Doughty, Dominion archivist at Ottawa. Each of the eleven sections into which the work is divided has its editor. The names of these chiefs of sections are such as to inspire the highest confidence. Thus, we have, for New France (volumes I. and II.), Professor Chapais of Laval University; for British Dominion (1760-1840, volumes III. and IV.), Dean F. P. Walton of McGill University; for United Canada (1840-1867, volume V.), Professor W. L. Grant; for The Dominion: Political Evolution (volumes VI., VII., and VIII.), Professor George M. Wrong; for The Dominion: Industrial Expansion (volumes IX. and X.), Dr. James Bonar; for The Dominion: Missions, Arts, and Letters (volumes XI. and XII.), Dr. Doughty. The remaining volumes, to XXII., deal with the political and industrial history, and the institutions, of the individual provinces, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The twenty-third volume, soon to be published, will contain critical and explanatory notes (for few foot-notes accompany the texts) and a general index. The plan of the volumes is the familiar co-operative plan, calling for 153 special contributions, seven or eight to a volume upon the average. The best names among the historical scholars of Canada are to be found in the list of one hundred contributors, and in the main the chapters have been assigned to specialists of the highest competence. Two editions have been prepared, both very handsome and well supplied with illustrations marked by the highest interest and the highest quality of execution. The "Authors' Edition", the sale of which was confined to Canada, has already been disposed of. A vivid impression of Canadian national feeling and of Canadian interest in national history is obtained from the fact that

this whole edition of 875 copies, priced at something like \$350, was disposed of in Canada alone before the final volume was issued. The Edinburgh Edition, now announced, and of similar beauty of mechanical workmanship, will also consist of 875 sets, to be distributed among buyers in Great Britain and the United States.

Jefes del Ejército Mexicano en 1847: Biografías de Generales de División y de Brigada y de Coroneles del Ejército Mexicano por Fines del Año de 1847. Por Alberto M. Carreño. (Mexico, Secretaría de Fomento, 1914, pp. cccxxxiv, 259.) The essential portion of this volume consists of material compiled, Señor Carreño thinks, by General Gabriel Valencia. It is a series of copied or summarized (p. xii) records of generals and colonels—*hojas de servicios*—kept by the Mexican War Department, to which the editor has added a number of biographies, as well as extended or annotated others. The title-page promises a highly useful work, but one's hopes are not fully realized. The manuscript was prepared in 1840 (p. viii), and beyond that date we have only the more or less correct information supplied in a more or less random way by Señor Carreño. Nearly all of the official records are extremely meagre, and some of them are far enough from the truth. To Santa Anna, by all odds the foremost Mexican of the period, only thirty-nine lines are given (pp. 15, 16, 20). Of Valencia, in his palmy days a brute, sot, and revolutionist quite destitute of good qualities, it is said that he owed his promotions and high repute to his excellent civil and military conduct (p. 35). In the account of Ampudia, who commanded against Taylor at Monterey, we are told (p. 152) that "by the confession of the enemy themselves their loss in killed and wounded was 2204", whereas our figures—inclusive of the missing—were about five hundred. The record of Arista is particularly edifying. "Having been compelled", it states (p. 50), "to force the enemy to fight at the pass of Palo Alto, he gained great advantages, though on the following day in a second engagement fortune was adverse, and he had to retire with his Division to Matamoros after exposing himself a thousand times—even doing the duties of a common soldier—in the various charges led by him personally against the enemy, who through their superiority in artillery broke the columns at the head of which he was always found." The truth is, of course, that Arista lost instead of gaining in the wide, grassy plains of Palo Alto, and on May 9 remained in his tent until the battle had been won by the plain hard hitting of our infantry, upon which—after attempting one or two brave but futile charges—he fled precipitately with only a part of his troops. This account is, to be sure, taken by Señor Carreño from the year 1851, when Arista was president; but it shows how unreliable an *hoja de servicios* could be.

Introducing the biographical matter there is a longer prologue, done by the editor, sketching "the participation of the army in the political

life of Mexico during the first half of the nineteenth century". This is described by the author himself as "a most superficial summary" (p. cclxxi), and he also states that the time spent upon it was hardly two weeks (p. cccxxxiii). Criticism is therefore unnecessary; but some valuable first-hand material—particularly with reference to Paredes in pages clxv-clxxviii, and to the battle of "Contreras" in pages ccxc-cccviii—and signs of a wish to be correct should be mentioned. Naturally the false and irrational but consoling theory that the ruinous dissensions of Mexico were due to the machinations of our government is brought forth once more, and once more a simulacrum of Poinsett is banished to the wilderness as scapegoat.

The text is illustrated with poorly engraved portraits.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

Inter-American Acquaintances. By Charles Lyon Chandler. (Seewanee, Tenn., University Press, 1915, pp. vi, 139.) The author explains in his preface that he is a railway employee, and modestly disclaims any attempt at historical excellence or completeness. His purpose, he says, is to furnish proof "that the moral and material aid and example of the United States were a factor in the Latin-American wars of independence", and that before and during those wars "much was spoken and written by both North and South Americans" which forecast the Pan-American movement. Chronologically, the book covers the period from the close of the war for the independence of the United States to the close of the wars for the independence of the Latin-American countries, though a few earlier and later facts appear.

The first chapter, on the Beginning of Pan-American Relations, comprises nearly three-fourths of the book and is its valuable contribution. The second, entitled Citizens of the United States of America who took Part in the Latin-American War of Independence, 1810-1826, covers twelve pages. The same amount of space is given in the third chapter to the Pan-Americanism of Henry Clay. The fourth, on the Pan-American Origin of the Monroe Doctrine, occupies nine pages. The fifth, entitled Diversions in Euscaran: a Study in Persistently Influential Heredity, also occupies nine pages. This last chapter is only remotely connected with the rest of the book, being a study of the widespread influence which the Basques have exerted in Spanish America. An Epitome of Dates, 1807-1826, occupies the last eight pages.

Many passages are quoted from letters, speeches, public documents, magazines, newspapers, and books, indicating that the author has patiently gone through a large amount of historical material. Unfortunately the places where these materials are to be found are very rarely indicated. Hence the value of the work is much less than it might have been. This criticism is disarmed, however, by the author's statement that his book is "intended to be suggestive rather than directly instructive—to stimulate perhaps a few of those now engaged in studying

South American history in its various phases in our colleges and universities to elaborate its material into historical or economic studies of permanent value". This desirable effect it will doubtless have.

There are no foot-notes in the book. Incidental mention is made here and there of the book or periodical from which facts or quotations were taken; and in the later chapters a few exact citations are inserted between parentheses in the body of the page. It would have been much better if this plan had been followed throughout, in spite of the consequent interruption. Much irrelevant or only slightly related matter which might properly have appeared in foot-notes is incorporated in the body of the page, interrupting the orderly development of the thought and obscuring the main points. Numerous abrupt transitions contribute to the same end. There are so many awkward constructions, misplaced modifiers, and perfectly obvious misspellings that one is almost led to think the proof was never corrected, in spite of the fact that the preface mentions three persons who are said to have read it.

WILLIAM R. MANNING.

HISTORICAL NEWS

After twenty years' existence of this *Review*, its readers may be interested in a classified statement of the fields in which its many articles have lain. Following some such classification as that which has obtained in its section devoted to items of news, one may say that, of 397 articles, 48 have been general in their nature (chiefly the annual addresses of the presidents of the American Historical Association and the accounts of its meetings), that there have been 11 articles in ancient history, 19 in medieval history, 29 in modern (meaning articles in medieval and modern history not preferably classified under single countries), 61 in the history of Great Britain and Ireland, 30 in that of France, 16 in that of Italy or Spain, 9 in that of Germany, Austria, or Switzerland, 4 in that of Northern and Eastern Europe, 4 in that of the Far East. The articles in American history may be classified as follows: general, 18; economic, 12; diplomatic, 8; naval, 1; colonial and Revolutionary, 30; constitutional and political history of 1783-1861, 43; of the period of the Civil War and Reconstruction, 17; New England, 5; Middle Colonies or States, 8; South, 8; West, 10; Canada and Spanish America, 6. Too much stress should not be laid upon these details, for at least a third of the articles are of debatable classification; but the list has its significance as indicative of the interests of American historical writers. Equally significant data are however concealed in the larger items. Thus, it is a strange and not wholly creditable fact that out of nearly 400 articles only 8 have related to the history of Europe since 1815, and that, of the many articles in British history, only 11 have related to the eighteenth century and only one to the nineteenth.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The thirty-first annual meeting of the American Historical Association will take place in Washington on December 28-31, 1915 (four days, Tuesday to Friday inclusive). Headquarters will be at the New Willard Hotel. Organizations of similar purpose which will be meeting in Washington at the same time will be the Nineteenth Annual Congress of Americanists, the Anthropological Section of the Pan-American Scientific Congress, the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Society of International Law, the Anthropological Association, the American Folklore Society, and the Archaeological Institute of America. While the programme is not yet complete, its outlines can now be announced. The presidential address of Professor H. Morse Stephens, together with that of Professor W. C. Willcox, president of the American Economic Association, will be delivered at a joint session of the two bodies on the first evening. Other

(194)

joint sessions will be held with the Congress of Americanists and with two sections of the Pan-American Scientific Congress, with papers by Professor Bernard Moses, Mr. W. R. Thayer, Dr. David J. Hill, and Hon. Henry White; with the Political Science Association, President A. L. Lowell and Professor G. M. Wrong speaking, on the Growth of Nationalism in the British Empire; with the Naval History Society; with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, in a conference of teachers of history; and, with several related societies, a joint meeting intended to promote the erection in Washington of a National Archive Building. The usual special conferences of historical societies and of archivists will be held. In the session devoted to ancient history the topic will be, Economic Causes for International Rivalries in Ancient Times (Professors W. S. Ferguson and G. W. Botsford); in that on medieval history, Medieval Colonization (Professors D. C. Munro, J. W. Thompson, H. L. Gray, and A. C. Howland); in that on modern European history, The Origin and Significance of Modern National Feeling (Professor J. H. Robinson); and there will be one session devoted to American history (Dr. Frances G. Davenport, Dr. O. G. Villard, Dr. Victor S. Clark, and Professor William I. Hull); and perhaps one specially devoted to Pan-American history. The business meeting will be held on Wednesday afternoon, December 29. It will be remembered that the Association will then be called upon to take action upon the report of the Committee of Nine appointed last December "to consider the constitution, organization, and procedure of the Association", including the relations between the Association and the *American Historical Review*.

The last prize essay, Miss Williams's *Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815-1915*, is in press and should appear in November. The *Annual Report* for 1913, in two volumes, the second consisting of the Papers of James A. Bayard, edited by Miss Elizabeth Donnan, is being distributed to members at about the same time as the present number of the *Review*.

Writings on American History, 1913, the standard and invaluable bibliography prepared each year by Miss Grace Gardner Griffin, has just been issued by the Yale University Press. A volume of 193 pages, listing more than three thousand titles of books, pamphlets, and articles, it is an indispensable manual for the worker in American history. Members of the association are reminded once more of the importance of giving it their support.

In the *Original Narratives* series it is hoped that Mr. Bolton's *Spanish Exploration and Settlement in the Southwest* (California, New Mexico, and Texas, 1542-1690) will be issued by Messrs. Scribner this autumn, and that the final volume, *Early Narratives of the Northwest*, edited by Miss Louise Phelps Kellogg of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, will appear in the spring.

PERSONAL

Joseph Vidal de la Blache was killed in battle on January 29, 1915. He was the author of several works published by the Historical Section of the French General Staff, of which the most important was *L'Évacuation de l'Espagne et l'Invasion de France, 1813-1814* (2 vols., 1914), and had prepared two similar volumes on the campaigns of Eylau and Friedland which are promised for publication after the war. He also wrote *La Régénération de la Prusse après Iéna* (1910). It is regrettable to note the long list of recent graduates and students of the École des Chartes who are listed as "morts sur le champ d'honneur".

Professor Heinrich Brunner of Berlin, one of the most eminent authorities in the history of law, died at Kissingen August 12, at the age of seventy-six.

Guy S. Callender, professor in Yale University, editor of *Selections from the Economic History of the United States*, and a valued contributor to this journal, died August 8, at the age of 49. Before his call to Yale in 1903 he had taught at Wellesley, Harvard, and Bowdoin.

Dr. Howard L. Gray of Harvard University has been made professor of European history at Bryn Mawr College.

Miss Katharine S. Alvord, hitherto of the University of Wisconsin, has been called to DePauw University as assistant professor of history.

Dr. William L. Schurz of the University of California has been called to the University of Michigan as lecturer in Spanish-American history.

In the historical department of the University of Chicago Dr. Conyers Read has been made associate professor.

Dr. E. E. Robinson of Stanford University is spending the present academic year as resident lecturer in the University of Minnesota. Dr. A. C. Krey has been promoted to an assistant professorship in the latter institution.

Professor Jacob S. Schapiro, of the College of the City of New York, has been called to the State University of Iowa as professor of European history.

Dr. E. I. McCormac has been made associate professor of American history in the University of California, and Dr. Charles E. Chapman assistant professor. Messrs. K. C. Leebrick and Charles H. Cunningham have lately proceeded to Seville to work in the archives of the Indies, as agents of the university and of the Academy of Pacific Coast History.

Dr. Payson J. Treat of Stanford University has been given the full rank of professor. Professor Edward B. Krehbiel has leave of absence during the current year; his classes will be taken by Dr. Ralph H. Lutz of the State University of Washington.

GENERAL

The plans of the large series *Records of Civilization*, edited by Professor James T. Shotwell in collaboration with other Columbia professors, are disclosed, more fully than hitherto, in a recent circular. The aim of the series is to make accessible in English those sources of the history of Europe which are of prime importance in the understanding of western civilization. Much more extensive than the ordinary "source-book", the series, of which some seventeen volumes are already announced, will usually present all the significant parts of the sources most valuable for their particular period or portion of history, with such comments, studies, and bibliographies as will enable the reader to see the bearing of each source upon the modern fabric of history. A preliminary volume on the *History of History*—documents and commentary, edited by Professor Shotwell, is promised; but the first volume to appear will be *Hellenic Civilization*, edited by Professors G. W. Botsford and E. G. Sihler, to be issued this autumn by the Columbia University Press, from whom circulars describing the whole series can be obtained. This first volume will illustrate Greek civilization in all its aspects, from a wide variety of sources, more completely than has been done in any one preceding collection. Other volumes, of which at least parts can be expected within a year, are those on the Records of the Jews, edited by Professor Julius A. Bewer; on the Early Records of Christianity, by Mr. Harold H. Tryon; on the Medieval Historians (Orosius by Dr. Charles J. Ogden, and Gregory of Tours by Dr. Ernest Brehaut); on the Papacy, by Professor Shotwell and Miss Louise R. Loomis (*Liber Pontificalis*); and on Humanism and Critical Scholarship (part I, Laurentius Valla on the Donation of Constantine, by Professor Christopher B. Coleman). There is also provision for subsequent volumes dealing with the Hellenistic period and the early Middle Ages, with some plans also for the modern period. The undertaking is one of the greatest importance.

A new journal, *The Military Historian and Economist*, is shortly to begin publication, under the editorial conduct of Captain Arthur L. Conger, U. S. A., of the Army Service Schools at Fort Leavenworth, and of Professor Robert M. Johnston, of Harvard University. The plan contemplates the inclusion of articles, of unpublished documents of high value, and of a certain number of book-reviews. The first number to be issued, January 1, 1916, is expected to contain the following articles: Sea Power and the German Coast, by Contre-amiral Degouy; Sources for the History of the Mexican War, by Dr. Justin H. Smith; the Psychology of German War Finance, by Oliver M. W. Sprague; the Question of Guam, by B. K. Richard; an article by Captain Conger and, as documentary material, the journal of General D. S. Stanley. American and foreign contributors of high competence have, it will be seen, been secured. Documents of great interest are also in prospect. The

journal should receive a very hearty welcome, and is likely to be of great utility. The price of subscription will be \$3.00 per annum, and the address of the editors is 275 Widener Hall, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The *Report* of the Smithsonian Institution for 1914 contains a survey of recent studies respecting the early inhabitants of Western Asia, by Professor Felix von Luschan of Berlin, an account of recent excavations at Abydos, by M. Édouard Naville, and an article by M. Félix Regnault on the Rôle of Depopulation, Deforestation, and Malaria in the Decadence of Certain Nations.

Professor Henry L. Moore's *Economic Cycles: their Law and Cause* (New York, Macmillan, 1914, pp. viii, 149) discusses the relations of weather conditions, represented chiefly by the rainfall in the central part of the United States, and of the resulting crops, to the successive periods of prosperity and depression in business. He shows, with excellent statistical methods and reasoning, the existence of cycles of approximately thirty-three and eight years in duration, and exhibits the rhythmically changing values and prices which flow from them.

The second, or July, number of the *Catholic Historical Review* continues, with the same earnestness and intelligence as its predecessor, its very important task of promoting the study of church history in the United States. The three chief articles are by Monsignor Charles W. Currier, on the Church of Cuba (a sketch, merely); by Dr. James A. Rooney, on Early Times in the Diocese of Hartford, Connecticut, 1829-1874; and by Rev. H. C. Schuyler, on Father Sebastian Rale. The interesting list of documents from the *Berichte* of the Leopoldine Association is continued, and a correspondence between Archbishop Purcell and Cardinal Barnabo is printed, relating to the establishment of the American College at Rome and to the question of army chaplains (1857, 1862). The reviews of books now appear without signature.

A useful and readable work is Mr. B. E. Hammond's *Bodies Politic and their Governments*, published by the Cambridge University Press.

The Negro, by Professor W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, a recent issue in the *Home University Library*, is a summary of the history of the negro in Africa as well as in this country.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. T. Shotwell, *The Discovery of Time*, I., II., III. (*Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods*, April 15, May 15, June 15); E. Oberfohren, *Die Idee der Universalökonomie bei Boisguillebert und Argenson* (*Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, April); C. Turgeon, *Essai sur la Conception de l'Histoire et du Progrès d'après Proudhon* (*Revue d'Économie Politique*, May).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General reviews: J. Toutain, *Antiquités Romaines, 1913-1914* (Revue Historique, May); C. Lécivain, *Antiquités Latines, Publications Étrangères, 1913-1915* (*ibid.*, July).

The Antiquity of Man in Europe, by Professor James Geikie (New York, Van Nostrand), is closely allied in interest with the volumes by Elliot and Sollas reviewed in this number.

A book of importance to the student of ancient history, lately issued by the Metropolitan Museum of Art, is the *Catalogue of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus* (pp. lv, 596) by Professor John L. Myres of Oxford.

Volume XII. of Sir J. G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough* (Macmillan) consists of a bibliography and index, the former furnishing an excellent guide to the literature dealing with the customs of primitive mankind.

The Harvard University Press announces as in preparation *The Religious Thought of the Greeks from Homer to the Triumph of Christianity*, by Professor Clifford H. Moore, *Judaism at the Beginning of the Christian Era*, by Professor George F. Moore, and, in two volumes, *The Harvard Expedition to Samaria*, by Professor George F. Reisner, recording discoveries of the periods of Israelite, Babylonian, Greek, and Roman occupation, the former including the palace of Omri and Ahab, with contemporary ostraca giving the earliest known inscriptions in Hebrew, while those relating to the last period include the whole fortified city, with its temple of Augustus, founded by Herod the Great.

In a Princeton dissertation (University Press, 1915, pp. 94), *Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria*, Dr. Gustave A. Harrer essays to establish the list of the governors of Syria, Syria Coele, and Syria Phoenice, A. D. 70-305, with some notes on earlier governors, on procurators, on the separation of Syria and Cilicia, and on the revolt of Pescennius Niger.

Mr. Wilfred H. Schoff has completed the third section to be issued by the Commercial Museum of Philadelphia in its "graphic history of commerce". This is *The Parthian Stations of Isidore of Charax*, which consists of the Greek text, with a translation on the opposite page, fragments of the writings of Isidore, and a commentary. The preceding issue was the *Periplus of Hanno*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Meyer, *Aegyptische Dokumente aus der Perserzeit* (Sitzungsberichte der K. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1915, XVI.); J. Touzard, *Les Juifs au Temps de la Période Persane* (Revue Biblique, January); E. von Stern, *Die Politische und Sociale Struktur der Griechenkolonien am Nordufer des Schwarzmeergebietes* (Hermes, L. 2); A. Rosenberg, *Perikles und die Parteien in Athen* (Neue Jahrbücher, XXXV. 4); A. Wilhelm, *Bürger-*

rechtsverleihungen der Athener (Mitteilungen des K. Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, XXXIX.); R. Pichon, *Humanitarisme dans l'Ancienne Rome* (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 1); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Das Weltreich des Augustus* (Die Neue Rundschau, May); L. Bréhier, *Constantin et la Fondation de Constantinople* (Revue Historique, July); A. Schulten, *Ein Keltiberischer Städtebund* (Hermes, L. 2); F. Lot, *Les Migrations Saxonnes en Gaule et en Grande-Bretagne du III^e au V^e Siècle* (Revue Historique, May); G. W. Robinson, *Notes on the Fourth and Fifth Centuries* (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XXVI.).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

A distinctly popular, but well-written work on church history is Dean George Hodges's *The Early Church* (Houghton Mifflin), which extends to the fifth century.

In the second volume of his *Histoire Générale de l'Église* (Paris, Bloud and Gay, 1914, pp. 532), F. Mourret treats the fourth and fifth centuries, the period of the later Church fathers.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Jacquier, *Valeur Historique des Actes des Apôtres* (Revue Biblique, January); K. Bihlmeyer, *Die "Syrischen" Kaiser: Karakalla, Elagabal, Severus Alexander, und das Christentum*, I. (Theologische Quartalschrift, XCVI. 4).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Mr. G. F. Hill is the author of *The Development of Arabic Numerals in Europe*, a volume of 126 pages, illustrated by 64 tables, published by the Oxford University Press.

Mr. Joseph McCabe's *Crises in the History of the Papacy* is announced by Messrs. Putnam.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Amélineau, *La Conquête de l'Égypte par les Arabes*, I. (Revue Historique, July); C. Petit-Dutaillis, *De la Signification du Mot "Forêt" à l'Époque Franque* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January); E. Seckel, *Studien zu Benedictus Levita*, VIII. (Neues Archiv, XL. 1); A. Fliche, *Le Cardinal Humbert de Moyenmoutier: Étude sur les Origines de la Réforme Grégorienne* (Revue Historique, May); W. Miller, *The Genoese in Chios, 1346-1566* (English Historical Review, July); G. Schwartz, *Die Fälschungen des Abtes Guido Grandi* (Neues Archiv, XL. 1).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The seventh volume of the *Transactions* of the Jewish Historical Society of England includes a paper on Crypto-Jews in the Canaries by Mr. Lucien Wolf, and one on Jewish Pioneers of South Africa by Sidney Mendelssohn.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has brought out in a pamphlet the declarations of the Hague Peace Conferences concerning the conduct of war on land and sea.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Dürr, *Ludwig XI.; die Aragonesisch-Castilianische Heirat und Karl der Kühne* (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung, XXXV. 2); E. Rott, *La Participation Helvétique aux Traités de Westphalie, 1646-1648* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXIX. 4); E. Heyck, *England und Holland im Kampf um die Seeherrschaft* (Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte, March); Comte E. Frémy, *Causes Économiques de la Guerre de Hollande, 1664-1672* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXIX. 4); A. Albert-Petit, *Comment l'Alsace est devenue Française* (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 1); J. Flach, *Les Affinités Françaises de l'Alsace avant Louis XIV.* (*ibid.*, July 1); Hubert Hall, *The League of Armed Neutrality* (Contemporary Review, August); Charles Kuhlman, *Pacifism as an Offspring of the French Revolution* (Mid-West Quarterly, July); R. Cessi, *Émile Gaudin et la Politique Française à Constantinople en 1792, d'après des Documents Vénitiens*, I. (Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire, October, 1914); W. M. Kozlowski, *Kosciuszko et les Légions Polonaises en France*, I. (Revue Historique, May); H. Welschinger, *Les Préliminaires d'Iéna* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 1); A. Gérard, *L'Hégémonie Allemande et le Réveil de l'Europe, 1871-1914* (*ibid.*, May 15); F. Rachfahl, *Deutschland und die Balkanfrage im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, January, April).

THE GREAT WAR

The second Belgian Gray Book of *Correspondance Diplomatique relative à la Guerre de 1914-1915*, containing documents relating to the German invasion and occupation, and a French translation of the Italian Green Book, are issued by Hachette of Paris.

The elimination of the correspondent and the dry brevity of the daily official *communiqués* make it well-nigh impossible for the general reader to visualize for himself, in anything like a clear and comprehensive way, what is actually going on over a small section of the enormously extended front. Accordingly there has been attached to the British headquarters in France an official chronicler whose duty it is to prepare for the public narrative and descriptive accounts, based upon personal observation or compiled from reports of the operations of the British army. These accounts, which have appeared from time to time in the press, are now gathered together in a small volume, *Eye Witness's Narrative of the War: From the Marne to Neuve Chapelle, September, 1914-March, 1915* (London and New York, Longmans, 1915, pp. vii, 303). The volume, documented with general and special orders, extracts from soldiers' letters, etc., constitutes a genuine contribution to

the military history of the war, probably the principal contribution, for the phase to which it relates, that we shall have for some time. The style is simple and clear, devoid of technicalities, and possesses real literary merit.

Among the books on the causes, problems, and possible outcome of the present war, none in English presents a greater wealth of historical information or offers more stimulus to thought than *The War and Democracy* (London, Macmillan, 1915, pp. xiv, 390), a collaborative work by R. W. Seton-Watson, J. D. Wilson, A. E. Zimmern, and A. Greenwood. French reviewers are unanimous in bestowing the highest praise on *La Guerre* (Paris, Delagrave, 1915, pp. xii, 356) by Professor E. Denis of the Sorbonne, which has already reached its thirteenth edition. Monsignor Baudrillart has ably discussed *La Guerre Allemande et le Catholicisme* (Paris, Bloud and Gay, 1915). Perhaps the finest presentation of the German ideals will be found in Professor Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's *Reden aus der Kriegszeit* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1915), which has appeared in three parts containing eight addresses, including "Militarismus und Wissenschaft". A sensational volume is *J'Accuse, von einem Deutschen* (Lausanne, Payot, 1915, pp. 380; English translation, New York, Doran) which seeks "to break the evil charm" that holds the German people.

Under the title *La Guerre* (Paris, Alcan, 1915) are collected a series of lectures by E. Bourgeois, L. Renault, General Malletterre, R. G. Lévy, and D. Bellet on the causes of the war; Germany and international war; the war and the armies; the war and the finances; and modern industry and the war. French views on various problems connected with the war are set forth by François Charmes, the editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, in *L'Allemagne contre l'Europe: la Guerre, 1914-1915* (Paris, Perrin, 1915); by René Moulin, in *La Guerre et les Neutres* (Paris, Plon, 1915); by Professor A. Chuquet, in *De Valmy à la Marne* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1915); and by J. Finot, in *Civilisés contre Allemands* (Paris, Flammarion, 1915, pp. 347).

The general reader who wishes to acquaint himself with the French view as to the principal and more immediate causes of the war will find much of interest in *La Guerre Allemande: d'Agadir à Sarajevo (1911-1914)*, by Pierre Albin (Paris, Félix Alcan, 1915, pp. xv, 256). The author is of the opinion that since the establishment of the German Empire that power has mainly sought to prepare itself to take advantage of the propitious moment for imposing its leadership, by force of arms, upon Europe; and that since the incident of Agadir in 1911, this preparation passed from the expectant to the active plan. Starting from this point events, bearing upon Germany's relations with the other European powers, are recounted in some detail. Appendixes contain a chronology of the principal dates in European policy since

1871, and brief accounts of the triple alliance, the triple entente, and the Anglo-Japanese alliance.

Les Origines de la Guerre Européenne, by Auguste Gauvain (Paris, Armand Colin, 1915, pp. 333), is divided into two parts. The first part contains a rapid survey of the events, especially in the Balkan states, and of the diplomatic correspondence between the great powers that led up to the war. The second and considerably larger part consists of the writer's articles on European politics, that appeared in the *Journal des Débats* in June–August, 1915. The book does not add to our knowledge of the causes of the war, but the second part is an interesting exposition of the progression of French thought in the days before the opening of hostilities.

L. Cornet, the secretary of the French senate, has issued the first volume of 1914–1915, *Histoire de la Guerre* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1915, pp. 386), which carries the narrative to the battle of the Yser. A chronological account of the events in all the fields of operations to the close of 1914 is furnished by A. Masson, *L'Invasion des Barbares en 1914* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1915). An excellent account of permanent value is *Dixmude: un Chapitre de l'Histoire des Fusiliers Marins, 7 Octobre–10 Novembre 1914* (Paris, Plon, 1915, pp. xiii, 257) by C. Le Goffic. The *Chronik des Deutschen Krieges nach Amtlichen Berichten* in its second volume (Munich, Beck, 1915, pp. xxvi, 468) reaches January 17, 1915. Interesting accounts of the war conditions on the western front may be found in A. Fendricks, *Gegen Frankreich und Albion* (Stuttgart, Franckh, 1915, pp. 158); in Sven Hedin, *Ein Volk in Waffen* (Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1915, pp. v, 534); and in A. Tudesq, *Sur les Champs de Bataille, Choses Vues* (Paris, Tallandier, 1915).

A second volume of *La Guerre de 1914–1915: les Commentaires de Polybe* (Paris, Fasquelle, 1915), by Joseph Reinach, has appeared. The weekly articles on *Deutschland und die Grosse Politik* by Professor Schiemann of Berlin in the *Kreuzzeitung* to the close of 1914 have been collected in book form (Berlin, Reimer, 1915, pp. iv, 352). *Alemania contra el Mundo* (Buenos Aires, Otero, 1915, pp. 274) is a reprint of the articles contributed to *El Diario* by Dr. F. A. Barroetaveña, who strongly favors the Allies.

D. Schäfer has reprinted from his *Aufsätze* four articles under the title *Deutschland und England in See- und Weltgeltung* (Leipzig, Wolff, 1915, pp. 192). Professor Eduard Meyer has published *England: seine Staatliche und Politische Entwicklung und der Krieg gegen Deutschland* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1915, pp. xii, 213). Graf Ernst zu Reventlow expresses his anglophobia in *Der Vampir des Festlandes: eine Darstellung der Englischen Politik nach ihren Triebkräften, Mitteln, und Wirkungen* (Berlin, Mittler, 1915, pp. viii, 185).

The Oxford University Press has published *The Chronicle of Twelve Days, July 23–August 4, 1914*, with an interpretation by Mr. William Archer.

Mr. J. W. Headlam has collected the diplomatic papers immediately preceding the outbreak of the war, in *The History of Twelve Days, July 24th to August 4th, 1914*, published by Fisher Unwin. The Doran Company has also published a volume entitled *Collected Diplomatic Documents relating to the Outbreak of the European War*.

Professor John W. Burgess in *The European War of 1914: its Causes, Purposes, and Probable Results* (McClurg) gives an exposition of "the state of mind" of the German nation.

A French view of German colonial activities will be found in *La Provocation Allemande aux Colonies* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1915).

Though in only a minor part historical, the small book called *Problems of Readjustment after the War* (New York, Appleton, 1915, pp. vi, 186) deserves mention in these pages because of the weighty and thoughtful treatment given to several of these important problems in the essays of which it is composed. Professor Seligman's, on the Economic Interpretation of the War, stands out particularly; but those of Professors Hart on the War and Democracy, Giddings on the Crisis in Social Evolution, W. W. Willoughby on the Relations of the Individual to the State, G. G. Wilson on the War and International Law, and E. R. Johnson on the War and International Commerce and Finance, and that of Rear-Admiral Goodrich on the Conduct of Military and Naval Warfare, are all noteworthy and profitable.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Bergsträsser, *Die Diplomatischen Kämpfe vor Kriegsausbruch* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIV. 3); Baron Beyens, *La Semaine Tragique* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 1); E. de Martonne, *Les Conditions d'une Intervention Roumaine* (Revue de Paris, May 15); W. L. de Jaworski, *La Guerre Actuelle au Point de Vue de la Question Polonaise* (Scientia, May); M. Pavlovitch, *Deux Tactiques, Deux Plans de Guerre* (La Revue Politique Internationale, March); Count J. Andrassy, *Weltkrieg und Weltfreiheit* (Scientia, May); G. Alexinsky, *La Russie Démocratique et la Guerre, Réponse au Comte Jules Andrassy* (La Revue Politique Internationale, March); S. Schilder, *Weltwirtschaftliche Hintergründe des Weltkrieges* (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, January).

GREAT BRITAIN

Professor Laurence M. Larson has written for the American historical series published by Henry Holt and Company, a volume entitled *A Short History of England and the British Empire*.

The Harvard University Press is soon to issue, as *Harvard Historical Studies* XXII., a volume on *English Field Systems*, discussing the struc-

ture of open-field townships and the transformations of the open field, by Professor Howard L. Gray, now of Bryn Mawr College. The press also announces as in preparation a volume of *Studies in Anglo-Norman Institutions*, by Professor Charles H. Haskins, and one of *Essays on English Agrarian History in the Sixteenth Century*, by Professor Edwin F. Gay.

The Canterbury and York Society at its annual meeting in July reported that additional parts of the registers of Bishops John de Pontisara, Hamo de Hethe, and Simon de Gandavo were in press, and installments of the rolls of Richard Gravesend and the register of J. Trevenant, bishop of Hereford, were almost ready for publication.

The History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London, with an introduction on London and her gilds to the close of the fifteenth century, by Rev. A. H. Johnson (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2 vols.), is a substantial addition to economic history, executed with much thoroughness.

Studies in Tudor History, by Professor W. P. M. Kennedy of St. Michael's College, Toronto, ranges in subject from Henry VII. and his Policy to Elizabethan Parish Life.

Volume V. of the *Oxford Historical and Literary Studies* is an edition of the writings of Henry Tubbe, by Mr. G. C. Moore Smith. The editor has, in an excellent introduction of 64 pages, given a careful study of Tubbe's life along with his letters and literary studies. This is followed by his poems amply annotated and by his "meditations".

Quaker Women, 1650-1690, by Mabel R. Brailsford, is a sympathetic attempt to picture the ideals and the work of the first Quaker women of England.

The Yale University Press issues Dr. R. B. Westerfield's *The Middleman in English Industry, particularly between 1660 and 1760* (pp. 334).

In the series of *World's Classics* published by the Oxford University Press is an interesting volume entitled *Selected Speeches on British Foreign Policy, 1738-1914*, compiled by Mr. E. R. Jones.

Professor W. T. Laprade of Trinity College in North Carolina is editing for the Royal Historical Society a body of transcripts made by the late B. F. Stevens from the papers of John Robinson, manipulator of the parliamentary election of 1784. The originals are now in the possession of the Marquess of Abergavenny. Professor Laprade also has in preparation a volume on the beginnings of the ministry of William Pitt the younger.

The Clarendon Press has published *The War Speeches of William Pitt the Younger*, selected by Mr. R. Coupland.

Miss Helen Bosanquet's *Social Work in London, 1869-1912: a History of the Charity Organization Society*, useful to all social workers, is published in New York by E. P. Dutton and Company.

In the second edition of his *Joseph Chamberlain* Mr. Alexander Mackintosh has added chapters on Mr. Chamberlain's last years and death.

In the series of *Portrait Biographies*, a brief but sympathetic appreciation of Lord Roberts has appeared from the pen of Mr. Mortimer Menpes, illustrated by eight portraits of Lord Roberts, by the author.

In a little brochure of 52 pages Armand Colin, Paris, publishes *L'Angleterre et la Guerre*, a lecture delivered in Paris on May 2, 1915, by Henry Wickham Steed, foreign director of the London *Times* and for many years correspondent of the *Times* at Berlin, Vienna, and Rome, in which he rapidly traces the foreign policy of England, as regards Continental matters, since 1912.

J. B. Coissac recently presented as his theses at the Sorbonne, *Les Universités d'Écosse depuis la Fondation de l'Université de Saint-Andrews jusqu'au Triomphe de la Réforme, 1410-1560* (Paris, Larousse, 1914, pp. 311), and *Les Institutions Scolaires de l'Écosse depuis les Origines jusqu'en 1560* (*ibid.*, pp. 79).

British government publications: *A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office*, ed. Sir H. C. Maxwell-Lyte; *Calendar of the Fine Rolls*, vol. V., Edward III., 1337-1347, ed. Maxwell-Lyte, A. E. Bland, and S. C. Ratcliff; *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters, X., 1447-1455*, ed. J. A. Twemlow; *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, Henry VII., vol. XI.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. E. Lunt, *Papal Taxation in England in the Reign of Edward I.* (*English Historical Review*, July); J. H. Round, *The House of Lords and the Model Parliament* (*ibid.*); W. Hooper, *The Tudor Sumptuary Laws* (*ibid.*); G. Constant, *L'Histoire Religieuse d'Angleterre depuis le Schisme jusqu'à nos Jours*, I. (*Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, XXIX. 4).

FRANCE

General review: C. Petit-Dutaillis, *Histoire de France, 1328-1498* (*Revue Historique*, July).

The northern and eastern provinces are dealt with in the third and final volume of Monsignor Duchesne's *Fastes Épiscopaux de l'Ancienne Gaule* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1915).

Joseph Fabre has added to his numerous works on Joan of Arc a volume on *Les Bourreaux de Jeanne d'Arc et sa Fête Nationale: Notices sur les Personnages du Procès de Condamnation, Documents sur la Fête du Patriotisme* (Paris, Hachette, 1915).

The *Correspondance de Joachim de Matignon, Lieutenant-Général du Roi en Normandie, 1516-1548* (Paris, Picard, 1914, pp. lxii, 211)

has been edited by L. H. Labande, keeper of the Monaco archives, and dedicated to Prince Albert I. of Monaco on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his accession. M. Labande is preparing an edition of the correspondence of Marshal Matignon, the nephew of Joachim.

The Société de l'Histoire de France has published another volume of Jules Lair and Baron de Courcel's *Rapports et Notices sur l'Édition des Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu* (II. 2, Paris, Laurens, 1914, pp. 354), containing, among other articles: "Quelques Collaborateurs de Richelieu", by L. Delavaud; and "Les Différents Étapes de la Rédaction des Mémoires, les Manuscrits, et les Ouvriers des Mémoires", by R. Lavollée. Other recent issues by the same society are the first volume, 1674-1676, of the *Correspondance du Maréchal de Vivonne relative à l'Expédition de Messine* (*ibid.*, pp. 424), edited by Jean Cordey; the fifth volume, 1707-1710, of the *Mémoires de Saint-Hilaire* (*ibid.*, pp. 340), which also contains his correspondence and other documents for the same years edited by Léon Lecestre; and the *Campagnes de Jacques de Mercoyrol de Beaulieu, Capitaine au Régiment de Picardie, 1743-1763* (*ibid.*, 1915, pp. vii, 457), edited by the Marquis de Vogüé and A. Le Sourd.

The late A. Brette completed all except a portion of the proof-reading of the fourth volume of his *Recueil des Documents relatifs à la Convocation des États Généraux de 1789* (Paris, Leroux, 1915). The volume contains materials for the generalities of Montauban, Auch, Bordeaux, La Rochelle, Poitiers, and Tours. It is to be hoped that suitable provision will be made for the completion of this valuable publication.

C. Perroud has published the second volume of his edition of the *Lettres de Madame Roland* (Paris, Leroux, 1915, pp. xx, 590) in the *Collection de Documents Inédits*.

The latest publication of the Commission de l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution is the first volume of *Les Cahiers de Doléances d'Angers pour les États Généraux de 1789* (Paris, Leroux, 1915, pp. cclxv, 418), edited by Dr. A. Le Moy. The second volume is in press.

An important addition to the little group of studies of departmental administration under Napoleon is Benaerts's thesis, *Le Régime Consulaire en Bretagne: le Département d'Ille-et-Vilaine durant le Consulat, 1799-1804* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. xii, 383). In his supplementary thesis on *Les Commissaires Extraordinaires de Napoléon Ier en 1814 d'après leur Correspondance Inédite* (Paris, Rieder, 1915, pp. xxiii, 239) he has exploited some interesting materials which were left untouched by Houssaye and other earlier writers.

A biography of Jean Jaurès, *l'Homme, le Penseur, le Socialiste* (Paris, *L'Émancipatrice*, 1915, pp. x, 435) has been published by C. Rappoport.

Makers of New France (London, Mills and Boon, 1915, pp. xxi, 246) contains sketches of the present leaders in the political life of France by Charles Dawbarn. *Raymond Poincaré, a Sketch* (London, Duckworth, 1914, pp. 169) is anonymous. *My March to Timbuctoo* (London, Chatto and Windus, 1915, pp. 169), in 1894, by General Joffre is given in English translation with a biographical introduction by Ernest Dimnet.

Professor Aulard recently presented to the Comité des Travaux Historiques, Section d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, a report on the collection of historical materials relating to the present war and to the conditions in France as modified by the existence of the war. Acting upon this report and its approval by the committee, the Minister of Public Instruction in May sent circulars to the mayors of communes directing the collection and preservation of official documents; and to officers of learned societies, history teachers, and other persons presumably interested, suggesting proper subjects for report and methods of collecting and presenting the materials illustrating the actual administration and the condition of the country during the time of the war. The circulars are reprinted in the April-May issue of *La Révolution Française*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: B. Krusch, *Die Neueste Wendung im Genovefa-Streit* (Neues Archiv, XL. 1); G. Monod, *Le Rôle de Paris dans la France du Moyen Âge* (Revue Historique, May); H. F. Delaborde, *Du Texte des Actes reproduits dans le Premier Registre de Philippe Auguste* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January); A. Aulard, *Patrie, Patriotisme avant 1789* (La Révolution Française, April); *id.*, *Patrie, Patriotisme sous Louis XVI. et dans les Cahiers* (*ibid.*, June); L. Dubreuil, *Les Origines de la Chouannerie dans les Côtes-du-Nord, I.-III.* (*ibid.*, February, April, June); G. Vauthier, *Fourcroy, Conseiller d'État* (Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire, October, 1914); H. Chouet, *Ney à Lons-le-Saulnier, 14 Mars 1815* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, March); Commandant Weil, *Les Cents-Jours* (Revue de Paris, July); H. Limbourg, *Le Duc d'Aumale et sa Troisième Campagne d'Afrique, la Smalah, Novembre 1842 à Juin 1843* (La Revue Hebdomadaire, July 3, 10).

ITALY AND SPAIN

I. del Lungo and P. Prunas have edited *N. Tommaseo e G. Capponi, Carteggio Inedito dal 1833 al 1874* (vols. I., II., Bologna, Zanichelli, 1914, pp. xii, 663; viii, 795). The third volume will cover the years after 1849.

Il Conte di Cavour e il suo Confessore (Bologna, Zanichelli, 1915, pp. 142) is a recent volume by M. Mazziotti.

Quaderni della Guerra, published by Treves of Milan, are the Italian counterpart to the *Oxford Pamphlets*.

An essay on *El Elemento Germánico en el Derecho Español* (Madrid, Imp. Clásica Española, 1915, pp. 106) is by Professor E. de Hinojosa.

A. Paz y Melia has published an elaborate study of the historian of the reign of Isabella I., *El Cronista Alonso de Palencia, su Vida y sus Obras, sus "Décadas" y las Crónicas Contemporáneas, Ilustraciones de las "Décadas", y Notas Varias* (Madrid, Revista de Archivos, 1914, pp. lxxxvii, 473).

The fourth volume of the *Catálogo Razonado de Obras Anónimas y Seudónimas de Autores de la Compañía de Jesús, pertenecientes a la Antigua Asistencia Española* (Madrid, Rivadeneyra, 1914, pp. vi, 606) by J. E. Uriarte, has appeared.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: B. Croce, *La Storiografia in Italia dai Cominciamenti del Secolo Decimonono ai Giorni Nostri*, I.-III. (*La Critica*, January, March, May); E. Crosa, *Lo Statuto del 1848 e l'Opera del Ministro Borelli, con Lettere Inedite di Carlo Alberto* (*Nuova Antologia*, June 16); L. Messedaglia, *La Campagna del 1848 nel Veneto e nell'Adriatico secondo Nuove Fonti* (*ibid.*); X., *Le Printemps à Rome, Mars-Mai 1915* (*Revue de Paris*, July); A. Chroust, *Der Tod des Don Carlos* (*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXXV. 3).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

General review: M. Buckner, *Zur Neuesten Literatur über die Entstehung des Kurfürstenkollegs* (*Historisches Jahrbuch*, XXXVI. 1).

Modern Germany and her Histories, by Antoine Guiland, is announced by Messrs. Jarrold.

Among recent contributions to German constitutional history in the Middle Ages is F. Schönherr, *Die Lehre vom Reichsfürstenstande des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1914, pp. viii, 156).

The Historical Commission for Hesse and Waldeck has published *Territorium und Reformation in der Hessischen Geschichte, 1526-1555* (Marburg, Elwert, 1915) by W. Sohm; while W. Kratz, *Landgraf Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels und die Deutschen Jesuiten, ein Beitrag zur Konvertitengeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg, Herder, 1915) is an issue of *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*.

In commemoration of the fifth centenary of the House of Hohenzollern in Brandenburg, Dr. Georg Schuster, the keeper of the Hohenzollern archives, has published a collection of studies *Aus der Geschichte des Hauses Hohenzollern* (Berlin, Runge, 1915, pp. 264), which is most valuable for the earlier portions of the period. F. Hirsch has edited the twenty-first volume of the *Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte des Kurfürsten Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg*, which is the thirteenth of the *Politische Verhandlungen* (Berlin, Reimer, 1915).

Professor Thorstein Veblen's *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution* (New York, Macmillan) is an important and stimulating discussion, by a brilliant economist, of the relations of German political and social history to the German industrial efficiency of the present day.

Paul Liman has written a sketch of *Der Kronprinz* (Minden, Köhler, 1914, pp. 299); and Bernhard von Hindenburg, of his brother *Paul von Hindenburg* (Berlin, Schuster and Löffler, 1915, pp. 74). F. Mittelmann has edited *Ernst Bassermann: sein Politisches Wirken, Reden, und Aufsätze* (Berlin, Curtius, 1915) to set forth the character and ideas of the leader of the National Liberals.

Tom von Prince has published *Gegen Araber und Wahehe, Erinnerungen aus meiner Ostafrikanischen Leutnantszeit, 1890-1895* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914). Evans Lewin has written of *The Germans and Africa* (London, Cassell, 1915, pp. xviii, 317); and Gordon Le Sueur, of *Germany's Vanishing Colonies* (London, Everett, 1915, pp. 190). The English conquest of German New Guinea is told in *Australians in Action in New Guinea* (Sydney, Penfold, 1915, pp. 97) by L. C. Reeves.

Le Syndic Butin et la Réunion de Genève à la France en 1798 (Geneva, Kundig, 1914, pp. 226), by Marc Peter, has been added to the considerable list of recent publications on Geneva in the revolutionary period.

At the instance of the Swiss Labor Commission, Dr. William E. Rappard has prepared a most excellent account of *La Révolution Industrielle et les Origines de la Protection Légale du Travail en Suisse* (Bern, Stämpfli and Company, 1914, pp. vii, 343), relating chiefly to the period from 1798 to the middle of the nineteenth century.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Cosack, *Konrads III. Entschuss zum Kreuzzug* (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung, XXXV. 2); J. Haller, *Heinrich VI. und die Römische Kirche*, I. (*ibid.*, XXXV. 3); F. Phillippi, *Zur Gerichtsverfassung Sachsens im Hohen Mittelalter* (*ibid.*, XXXV. 2); M. Klinkenborg, *Die Kurfürstliche Kammer und die Begründung des Geheimen Rats in Brandenburg* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIV. 3); T. Neubauer, *Wirtschaftsleben im Mittelalterlichen Erfurt* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 4); A. Westermann, *Zur Geschichte der Memminger Weberzunft und ihrer Erzeugnisse im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (*ibid.*, XII. 3, 4); J. Schlecht, *Dr. Johann Ecks Anfänge* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXXVI. 1); J. Schweizer, *Der Frankfurter Deputationstag vom Jahre 1590* (*ibid.*, XXXVI. 1); D. Bellet, *La Vérité sur l'Enrichissement de l'Allemagne* (Revue d'Économie Politique, March); F. Matthesius, *Der Auszug der Deutschen Studenten aus Prag, 1409* (Mitteilungen des Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen, LII. 3, 4, LIII. 1, 2); J. Gruntzel, *Oesterreichs Volkswirtschaft im Kriege* (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, April); F. Barbey, *Félix Desportes et la Réunion de Genève à la France en 1798* (Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire, July, 1914).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

Belgian Democracy: its Early History (London and New York, Longmans, 1915, pp. xi, 250) is a translation by J. V. Saunders of the work by Professor Henri Pirenne published in 1910. It relates mainly to the mediæval Flemish towns.

Dr. Hendrik Willem Van Loon, the author of *The Fall of the Dutch Republic*, has continued his sprightly narrative in *The Rise of the Dutch Kingdom, 1795-1813* (New York, Doubleday, Page, and Company, 1915, pp. xx, 279). An account of the ensuing period is by Frans Van Kalken, *Histoire du Royaume des Pays-Bas et de la Révolution Belge de 1830* (Brussels, Lebègue, 1914, pp. 254).

The latest issue in the series, *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt*, is *Belgien* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1915, pp. vi, 118) by Dr. Paul Osswald. The author purposely abstains, as far as possible, from reference to events of the past year, and has creditably supplied the lack in German of a good brief survey of the history and conditions of Belgium. *La Belgique sous la Griffes Allemande* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1915) is said to be the work of a prominent Brussels lawyer. The volume contains an appendix of the German laws and proclamations in force in Belgium. *Le Livre Rouge Belge: les Atrocités Allemandes en Belgique* (Paris, Bibliothèque des Ouvrages Documentaires, 1915, pp. 64) contains official reports. *Le Crime de Guillaume II. et la Belgique: Récits d'un Témoin Oculaire* (Paris, Auguste Picard, 1915, pp. xv, 255) is by Professor P. Van Houtte; and *La Belgique Sanglante* (Paris, *La Nouvelle Revue Française*, 1915) is by the well-known Belgian author, Émile Verhaeren.

Accounts of the military events of the present war in Belgium are presented in A. de Gobart, *La Campagne de 1914 en Belgique, Sous la Botte Allemande, Notes et Reportages* (Paris, Paris-Télégrammes, 1915, pp. 146), and in F. H. Grimaudy, *Six Mois de Guerre en Belgique, par un Soldat Belge, Août 1914-Février 1915* (Paris, Perrin, 1915).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The Norwegian Commission for Historical Documents is issuing *Eirspennill*, an account of the lives of the kings of Norway, edited by Professor Finnur Jónsson.

An error was made in announcing the publication, in our July number, of a "History of Poland" by Dr. Robert H. Lord. Dr. Lord has in preparation a *History of the Second Partition of Poland*, which the Harvard University Press will bring out this autumn.

The former premier of Bulgaria, I. E. Guéchoff, has presented the Bulgarian view of the events of the past three years in *L'Alliance Balkanique* (Paris, Hachette, 1915). *Les Pays Balkaniques* (Paris, Delagrave, 1915), by General Niox, is compiled from his lectures at the École Militaire. Some essays on the Rumanian situation are collected

in *La Roumanie Contemporaine: son Importance dans le Concert Balkanique et pour la Guerre Présente* (Paris, Plon, 1915) by C. D. Mavrodin. Professor E. Denis of the Sorbonne has given a full account of the fortunes of the several groups of Serbs, with a thorough study of the events in the nineteenth century and with special attention to the events of the past dozen years, in *La Grande Serbie* (Paris, Delagrave, 1915).

A readable book and one based on considerable first-hand knowledge is Captain Walter Christmas's *Life of King George of Greece* (McBride).

Albania, the Foundling State of Europe, by Mr. Wadham Peacock (Appleton), contains an able sketch of Albanian history.

Ahmed Emin, the author of *The Development of Modern Turkey as measured by its Press* (Longmans), received his historical training in this country. His is a thoroughgoing study which throws light on Turkish life and thought during two centuries.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Lipinska, *La Lithuanie en 1812* (*Revue des Études Napoléoniennes*, March); M. Nettlau, *Bakunin und die Russische Revolutionäre Bewegung in den Jahren 1868-1873* (*Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, V. 3); Nélidow, *Souvenirs d'avant et d'après la Guerre de 1877-1878* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 15, July 15).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

In the series of materials for the history of Japan which the Imperial Historical Commission is publishing, volume XII. of series 12 consists of documents relating to the embassy which was sent out by Masamune in 1613 and which proceeded to Mexico, Rome, and Spain, returning in 1617.

The Secret Memoirs of Count Tadasu Hayashi, edited by A. M. Pooley, covers the years from 1902 to 1908.

Ceylon: the Portuguese Era, by P. E. Pieris, a native Hindu, graduated from Cambridge, now in the Ceylon civil service (Colombo, the Apothecaries Company, 2 vols.), is a history of the island from 1505 to 1658.

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress has recently acquired the diary of Samuel W. Crawford, and letters from F. W. Pickens, P. T. Beauregard, W. H. Trescot, and others, all relating to Fort Sumter in 1860-1861; 65 documents of Governor John Archdale of North Carolina, 1694-1706; letters of Silas Brown, 1805-1817, giving an account of a journey to Natchez; miscellaneous correspondence of Peter

Force, 1815-1865, some 350 letters; seven volumes of West Florida records transferred from the General Land Office; five volumes of transcripts of official records of Guam, 1721-1856; and six volumes of copies and translations of letters, 1717-1739, that passed between Great Britain and Spain, relative to British rights in American territory claimed by Spain.

In the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla*, III., no. 8, Don Pedro Torres Lanzas presents some documents relating to the foundation of the building now used for the archives, the Casa Lonja. In no. 9-10 Professor German Latorre continues his studies of American cartography, and reproduces a map of southern Bolivia of 1588 and a plan of Mendoza at the time of its foundation in 1562. Señor Manuel Serrano Sanz presents the first installment of an extended article on Spain and the Cherokees and Choctaws in the second half of the eighteenth century, with documents from the Archives of the Indies. The second installment appears in no. 11, which also has a list of Florida maps possessed by the Cuerpo de Ingenieros de Ejército.

American Diplomacy, by Professor Carl Russell Fish, has recently appeared from the press of Henry Holt.

The University of Minnesota has issued, as *Studies in the Social Sciences*, no. 2, *Federal Land Grants to the States*, with special reference to Minnesota, by Dr. Matthias N. Orfield, in which, after some study of colonial precedents, the federal land grants for educational purposes, those for internal improvements, the saline and swamp land grants, are studied in detail, with a careful chapter upon the authority of the federal government over the public domain and a full study of the administration of the public lands in Minnesota.

The best private collection of naval memorabilia in this country is, as is well known, that formed by the late Captain James Barnes, U. S. N. It embraces some 3500 printed volumes and a great mass of original manuscripts—letters, log-books, etc.—connected with the history of the United States Navy, embracing many invaluable items. This splendid collection Mr. James Barnes has generously presented to the Naval History Society, as a memorial of his father.

Volume VIII. (1790-1792) of Charles Evans's *American Bibliography* has come from the press (Chicago, the author).

The Magazine of History, in the February number, reprints from the *Boston Transcript* some notes concerning Washington's connections with Selby, England, and from the *New York Press* some materials, from the pen of Guido Bruno, upon the German-Dutch branch of the original Washington family. Other articles are: Some Public Services of Washington commonly overlooked, by W. Scott, and the *Constitution*: the Last of the Old Navy, by C. N. Holmes. The March-April number contains an article by Obed Edson on Stephen Brulé and his

visit to Western New York in 1615, one by Brigadier-General Philip Reade concerning Massachusetts at Valley Forge, chiefly relating to Colonels Michael Jackson, William Shepard, and John Bailly, three letters written by Robert Biddulph from New York in 1779, some letters and extracts of letters from Ebenezer Huntington, Samuel Huntington, and David Wooster in 1775, from John L. Gervais to Henry Laurens in 1782, from Andrew Jackson to John Sevier in 1803, from John B. Floyd to C. J. Faulkner in 1859, from General Sherman to General Schofield in 1865, and from Sir Brook Watson, written from Montreal in 1775. The May number contains an article by Professor Lorenzo Sears on Joseph Hawley, the Counsellor of the Boston Patriots.

It is announced that Harper and Brothers have in press a new edition of *Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History*.

The January-April and the May-August numbers of the *German American Annals* contain two installments of a paper by L. C. Baker on the German Drama on the New York Stage to 1830 and a continuation of C. F. Brede's account of the German Drama on the Philadelphia Stage.

Two articles of interest appear in the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* for June. They are the Preservation of Catholic Documents, by L. M. Flick, and "A Young Catholic Explorer", by J. J. Walsh. The latter article is a sketch of Harry V. Radford and an account of his explorations in Northwest Canada in 1913, which were ended by the murder of the explorer by the Eskimos.

Cardinal Diomede Falconio, formerly apostolic delegate in Washington, published not long since an historical work entitled *I Minori Riformati negli Abruzzi* (Rome, Tipographia Nazionale, 1913, 1914, 3 vols., pp. 282, 391, 524). The title may not lead the inquirer to the knowledge that several chapters deal with the history of the Franciscans in the United States and in Newfoundland in the last generation.

Messrs. Scribner have brought out a sixth revised and enlarged edition of A. H. Newman's *History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*.

The Recognition Policy of the United States, by Dr. Julius Goebel, jr., appears among the *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*.

Mr. Lawrence B. Evans of the Massachusetts bar has brought out through Callaghan and Company of Chicago a book of *Cases on Constitutional Law*. The cases are topically arranged and the great precedent-making cases are usually printed in extenso.

Rear-Admiral Chadwick, in *The American Navy*, one of the series entitled *American Books* published by Doubleday, Page, and Company, has given a condensation of our naval history and a bibliographical guide for further study.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

A. Roviglio is the author of *L'Umanesimo e la Scoperta dell'America* (Udine, Del Bianco, 1915, pp, 54).

An American Garland, a collection of ballads relating to America, 1563-1759, compiled and edited by Professor C. H. Firth, will probably interest a great many students of American history (Oxford, Blackwell).

Early Opera in America (New York, G. Schirmer), by Mr. Oscar G. Sonneck, chief of the Division of Music in the Library of Congress, rivals in thoroughness of research his former volume on *Early Concert Life in America*, and makes surprisingly great additions to our knowledge of operatic performances in America from 1735 to the end of the eighteenth century.

Captives among the Indians: First-Hand Narratives of Colonial Times, edited by Horace Kephart, has been issued as a volume of the *Outing Adventure Library* (Outing Publishing Company).

The June serial of the Massachusetts Historical Society contains a letter of John Adams to William Plumer, March 28, 1813, describing the passage through Congress, in 1776, of the resolution for independence.

Volume V. of the *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, edited by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, has come from the press. The volume covers the years 1814-1816.

C. F. Heartman of New York has included in *Heartman's Historical Series* the *Narrative of Richard Lee Mason in the Pioneer West, 1819*.

The Military Order of the Loyal Legion, Wisconsin Commandery, has published volume IV. of its *War Papers* (Milwaukee, Burdick and Allen).

The Creed of the Old South, by Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve, published by the Johns Hopkins Press, contains two remarkable *Atlantic* articles by this famous scholar, profitable reading for every cultivated student of the Civil War.

Recollections of a Cavalryman of the Civil War after Fifty Years, 1861-1865, by W. D. Hamilton, is from the pen of an officer of the Ninth Ohio Cavalry (Columbus, the author).

Campaigns of the One Hundred and Forty-Sixth Regiment, New York State Volunteers, by Mary G. G. Brainard (Putnam), is a compilation of letters, diaries, newspaper fragments, and reminiscences of this regiment in the Civil War.

Lights and Shadows in Confederate Prisons, by Colonel Homer B. Sprague, relates the author's experiences as a prisoner during the last months of the Confederacy (Putnam).

In a pamphlet of 16 pages entitled *The Last Railroad Flag of Truce during the Civil War*, Mr. Dallas T. Ward (Franklinton, N. C.) describes the journey to Sherman to surrender the city of Raleigh to him, in March, 1865, a railroad journey in which the writer, then nineteen, acted as conductor on the train which carried the party to Sherman.

Mr. B. P. DeWitt's *The Progressive Movement* (New York, Macmillan, pp. xli, 376) may be recommended to the general reader as a fair-minded survey of one of the most interesting aspects of recent American history.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

The Acorn Club has issued as its latest publication (1915) the series of nine reports to the Board of Trade which Francis Fane, its legal adviser, made upon a long series of Connecticut statutes (387 in all), submitted to him for official examination. The laws, covering the period from the law-book of 1715 to 1731, were sent to Fane in 1732 but the last of his reports was not rendered until 1741. Though no action was taken upon them they contain interesting matter, to which Professor Charles M. Andrews has prefaced an introduction of 54 pages dealing with Fane and the processes of British examination of Connecticut statutes.

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library announces a large addition (about 4500 pieces) to the papers of John Tayler and John Tayler Cooper, recent acquisitions of naval correspondence of the period just after the Civil War, and papers respecting the New Hampshire Grants, 1770-1775. A very important collection, of several thousand manuscripts, recently deposited in the library, embraces the papers of Peter Gansevoort, 1802-1813, of Peter Gansevoort, jr., 1819-1821, and especially of Abraham Yates, jr., chiefly 1754 to 1795, and including interesting material respecting the Constitution. It is expected that a volume or volumes of the Yates Papers, edited by Mr. Paltsits, will be published. Other accessions are: a body of papers relating to the Albany Basin, another relating to Schoharie County, a collection of 1272 papers of the Van Rensselaer and Livingston families, and a journal kept throughout the year 1798 by Thomas Boylston Adams when secretary to his brother J. Q. Adams at Berlin. This last will also be published. The July *Bulletin* contains a supplementary list of newspapers, embracing recent accessions. Of these the most notable are files of the *Moniteur* and *Journal Officiel*, the *Gaceta de Madrid*, and the *Gaceta de Puerto Rico*.

It is expected that the next volume (XXI.) of the *Harvard Historical Studies* will be a documentary volume, *Wraxall's Abridgment of the New York Indian Records, 1678-1751*, edited by Professor C. H. McIlwain. Since the burning of the New York State Library at Albany Professor McIlwain's transcription of these Indian records of New York has been the only one in existence.

The Long Island Historical Society has brought out the *Records of the Town of Jamaica, Long Island, New York, 1656-1751*, edited by Josephine C. Frost.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has recently acquired a body of manuscripts of Commodore P. S. P. Conner; a collection of more than four thousand newspapers made by Richard Rush; two interesting letters written at Valley Forge by Colonel Israel Shreve and Colonel Alexander Scammell; 52 additions to the Gratz Collection, and 48 to the Dreer Collection.

The most considerable article in the July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* is a first installment of a contribution by Mr. Simon Gratz of Some Material for a Biography of Mrs. Elizabeth Ferguson, *née* Graeme, socially prominent in Philadelphia in the days of the Revolution and especially noted as the bearer of the famous Duché letter. The material includes many letters to her, from 1757 to 1795, among them letters from William Franklin, Richard Peters, Dr. William Smith, and Elias Boudinot. Other contents of this number are: the Passing of the Harmonites: a Story of a Successful Communistic Adventure, by Rev. C. E. Macartney, a continuation of the extracts from the diary of Thomas Franklin Pleasants, 1814, and a letter from John Morton to Anthony Wayne, 1776.

The June number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* includes a biographical sketch of Robert Goldsborough (1733-1788), member of the Continental Congress 1774-1776, a brief article, by Clayton C. Hall, on the Great Seal of Maryland, the replica of which was recently discovered, a paper, by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, concerning John J. Crittenden's Maryland Correspondents, and some extracts from the Carroll papers, 1750-1757, being principally letters of Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

Maryland in National Politics, by J. F. Essary, is a series of sketches of distinguished Marylanders and their part in the nation's history (Baltimore, Murphy).

Mr. Morgan P. Robinson, archivist in the Virginia State Library, has carried out the systematic flat-filing of a section of the documents in the archive room amounting to more than fifteen thousand pieces, and the indexing of them. He is preparing a *Bulletin* of the Library on the establishment of counties by Virginian legislation. The archives also have completed lists of colonial soldiers of Virginia and of Virginia soldiers of the War of 1812.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* prints in the July issue, from a manuscript volume recently discovered by Mr. Charles F. McIntosh in the Norfolk County clerk's office at Portsmouth, some acts, orders, and resolutions of the general assembly of Virginia at the sessions of 1643-1647, which are not found in Hening. Mr. David I.

Bushnell's paper in this issue, in his series of studies of the Virginia frontier in 1778, relates to General Lachlan McIntosh. The magazine also prints in this issue an alphabetical list of the abstracts of wills, etc., contributed to the magazine by the late Lothrop Withington.

The *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* reprints in the July issue, from Garland's *Life of John Randolph of Roanoke*, a chapter concerning the school-days of Randolph, and from the *Washington Post* of March 9, 1912, a letter of Robert L. Preston, discussing the question Did the *Monitor* or *Merrimac* revolutionize Naval Warfare?

The first number of the *Richmond College Historical Papers*, edited by Dr. D. R. Anderson, head of the department of history and political science in Richmond College, made its appearance in June. Among its contents are brief biographies of John Minor Botts, anti-secessionist, Richard Henry Lee, William Cabell Rives, and John Moncure Daniel. They are by Clyde C. Webster, Ethel Smithers, R. S. Wingfield, and A. N. Wilkinson, respectively. The most valuable part of the issue is a group of letters, 1775-1776, principally from Colonel William Woodford, Colonel Robert Howe, and General Charles Lee, to Edmund Pendleton, president of the Virginia Convention. The letters are found in the Virginia State Library and a few of them have been printed before. The *Papers* are to appear annually.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* continues in the April number Judge Henry A. M. Smith's papers on Old Charles Town and its Vicinity, etc., the Parish Register of St. James', Santee, supplied by Miss Mabel L. Webber, and the Order Book of John Faucheraud Grimké.

Professor Yates Snowden of the University of South Carolina has been making a study of early trade associations and labor combinations in South Carolina and has now brought some of these studies together in a pamphlet, to which he has given the title *Notes on Labor Organizations in South Carolina, 1742-1861*, and which he has published as a *Bulletin of the University of South Carolina* (Columbia, the University Press).

The Bureau of Education has issued as *Bulletin 12* of 1915 a *History of Public School Education in Alabama*, by Dr. Stephen B. Weeks (pp. 209).

The Louisiana Historical Society is causing to be prepared by Mr. William Price a calendar of the contents of 132 boxes of records of the French and Spanish régime, preserved in the Cabildo at New Orleans, and recently brought to light. These records extend from about 1714 to 1803 and comprise from 150,000 to 200,000 documents. The material thus far examined (the contents of the first box) is of the years 1714, 1717-1729, and consists mostly of papers coming before the Superior Council in its judiciary capacity. They include wills, marriage con-

tracts, accounts, petitions of all sorts, summonses, testimony in cases before the council, decisions, court orders, letters, etc. They throw much light on every-day life, on administrative and on economic history (prices of slaves and commodities, terms of labor and of land-holding, etc.), and are the more valuable as the bulk of the French archives of Louisiana are presumed to have been lost at sea, after the cession to Spain.

Dr. Dunbar Rowland, director of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, makes the important announcement of an intention to publish the official letter-books kept by William C. C. Claiborne as governor of Mississippi territory, of the territory of Orleans, and of the state of Louisiana, 1801-1816. Six volumes are to be issued (Jackson, Miss., Archives Publishing Company).

The June number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains an article on the Wisconsin constitution of 1847, by Professor Frederic L. Paxson; one on the Settlement of Michigan Territory, by Dr. George N. Fuller; and the conclusion of an article on the Methods and Operations of the Scioto Group of Speculators by Professor Archer B. Hulbert. Dr. Solon J. Buck of the Minnesota State Historical Society presents a comprehensive survey of recent historical activities in the Old Northwest. Among the notes, the chief is one by Dr. M. M. Quaife, upon the additional records of the Lewis and Clark expedition discovered since Dr. Thwaites edited their journals.

The official directors of state historical interests in the older Northwestern states are arranging plans for a co-operative search of Washington archives on behalf of all the institutions concerned.

Dr. I. Lippincott, in a privately printed book entitled the *History of Manufactures in the Ohio Valley to the year 1860* (Chicago, 1914, pp. 214), makes a solid contribution to the economic history of the United States, with careful attention to the earlier period of home manufactures, but with fuller treatment of the "mill period" of small manufacturing establishments from 1830 to 1860.

The Michigan Historical Commission has completed the work undertaken some years ago by the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society of translating, after collation with the originals, all the documents printed in Margry's *Découvertes et Établissements des Français*. In the interval before printing, the translations have been deposited in the Burton Historical Collection, in the Detroit Public Library. There they can be examined by students, and copies of particular portions can be furnished at the cost of the typewriting.

The Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society held its forty-first annual meeting at Lansing on June 2 and 3. Among the addresses delivered were the following: Manasseh Cutler's Relations to Higher Education in the Northwest, by Professor John C. Shedd, Historic Sites in

Detroit, by Mr. Clarence M. Burton, and the Story of the Government Operations in Surveying and Charting the Great Lakes from the Beginning of the Work in 1841 to the Present, by Mr. John Fitzgibbon. There was also a conference on the methods of co-operation on the part of public libraries, patriotic societies, and county historical societies with the Michigan Historical Commission in gathering and publishing materials relating to the history of the state.

The *Indiana Magazine of History* prints in the June number, under the title Steamboating on the Ohio and Mississippi before the Civil War, some reminiscences of Captain Wilson Daniels, author of *Sixty Years of Steamboating*. There are also two papers of reminiscences of the Civil War, chiefly relating to Andersonville prison.

The collection of Kaskaskia manuscripts found by Professor Alvord in 1905 has now been returned to the custody of the clerk of the circuit court of Randolph County, Illinois, at Belleville, after thorough repairing, mounting, and the provision by the county of a fireproof repository for it.

The Illinois Whigs before 1846, by C. M. Thompson, is published in the University of Illinois *Studies in the Social Sciences*.

The principal article in the June number of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* is a first installment of a biography of General James Winchester, 1752-1826, treating chiefly of his services in the War of 1812. A roster of the Confederate government, 1861-1865, is a serviceable contribution from W. E. Beard. The documentary offering in this number of the *Magazine* is of more than ordinary interest, being a series of letters from William B. Campbell of Tennessee to Governor David Campbell of Virginia, written principally from Mexico in 1846 and 1847. Mr. Donald L. McMurry's study of the Indian Policy of the Federal Government and the Economic Development of the Southwest, 1789-1801, is concluded.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has issued during the summer the volume of its *Proceedings* for 1914, and volume I. of a series of calendars of the Draper Manuscripts. Volume XXI. of the *Collections*, which is to be the index to volumes I. to XX., is appearing at about the same time with this publication. The society has received as a gift a large collection, more than 180 bound volumes, of the letters and other papers of Cyrus Woodman, who for twenty years in the middle of the nineteenth century was prominent, as attorney and register of the land-office, in the affairs of southern Wisconsin. The annual address before the society at its approaching October meeting is to be delivered by Dr. Gaillard Hunt of the Library of Congress. The society expects to publish during the coming year the various Lewis and Clark records which have been brought to light among the Biddle Papers during the last year, including the journal of Sergeant Ordway, and a

body of extracts from the journal kept by Captain Mackay during explorations upon the upper Missouri in 1795-1797.

The Minnesota Historical Society has carefully arranged and filed the papers of Ignatius Donnelly, nearly fifty thousand in number, and the recently rediscovered papers of James W. Taylor, special agent of the Treasury Department in Minnesota from 1859 to 1868, and United States consul at Winnipeg from 1870 to 1893. The society has embarked upon a special effort to make a comprehensive collection of material for Scandinavian-American history. Volume XV. of the society's *Collections*, issued this spring, contains a committee report on the "Kensington Rune Stone" and articles on the Beginning of Railroad Building in Minnesota; Railroad Legislation in Minnesota, 1849-1875; the "Five Million Dollar Loan" (by Professor W. W. Folwell); the Public Lands and School Fund of Minnesota; the Little Crow Uprising, and the Sioux War. The society expects to publish the papers of Gov. Alexander Ramsey. The first volume of Professor Folwell's new history of Minnesota will probably be published early in 1916. No. 2 of the society's *Bulletin* contains an article by Herbert A. Kellar on the Minnesota State Archives, their Character, Condition, and Historical Value. The *Eighteenth Biennial Report* of the society (1913 and 1914), issued as a supplement of the *Bulletin*, has also appeared.

Mr. Jacob Van der Zee is the author of two articles in the July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, an account of the "Neutral Ground", a strip of territory purchased from the Indians by the United States in 1830 and designed to serve as a barrier against intertribal war, and also an account of the Black Hawk War and the Treaty of 1832.

J. W. Cheney writes for the July issue of the *Annals of Iowa* the story of the L. J. Rose emigrant train, which left Iowa for California in the spring of 1858.

The Missouri Historical Society has lately acquired an unsigned journal of an expedition up the Missouri River in 1812-1813, conducted by Manuel Lisa. The journal is supposed to have been kept by John C. Luttig, storekeeper of the expedition. The society hopes to publish it in the course of a few months. It has also acquired a large collection of Chouteau manuscripts, and a significant letter written by Meriwether Lewis, dated Chickasaw Bluffs, September 16, 1809, a little more than three weeks before his death.

The principal article in the July number of the *Missouri Historical Review* is by Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker, on Six Periods of Missouri History.

Articles of historical interest in the July number of the *Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota* are: the Evolution of America (continued), by Frank L. McVey; Law versus Prerogative: a Sketch

of British Democracy, by Professor Chester Martin; Some Debt Histories of North Dakota Cities, by J. E. Boyle; Some Facts concerning the Germans of North Dakota, by W. G. Bek; and Some Recent Decisions of the Supreme Court of North Dakota, by Professor O. G. Libby.

A *Biography of Senator Alfred Beard Kittredge: his complete Life Work*, by Oscar W. Coursey, has been published in Mitchell, South Dakota, by the Educator Supply Company.

The July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* contains, beside continued articles, a paper by O. G. Jones on Local Government in the Spanish Colonies as provided by the *Recopilación de Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias*.

Spanish Mission Churches of New Mexico, by ex-Governor L. B. Prince, has been issued by the Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

The contents of the July issue of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* include the Last Stand of the Nez Percés, by Nelson C. Titus; a Japanese View of the Monroe Doctrine, by Oshima Shoichi; Organizers of the First Government in Oregon, by George H. Himes; and a Journal of Occurrences at Nisqually House, 1833, edited by Hon. Clarence B. Bagley. The latter is a journal kept by the superintendent of the Puget Sound Agricultural Company, a subsidiary of the Hudson's Bay Company, at Fort Nisqually.

The *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* for March contains an account, by Thomas W. Prosch, of the Indian War in Washington Territory in 1855 and 1856, an article by J. N. Barry, on Spanish and French Relics in America, and some correspondence (1843-1844) of Rev. Ezra Fisher, pioneer missionary of the American Baptist Home Mission Society in Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Oregon. The correspondence, which is edited by Sarah Fisher Henderson, Nellie E. Latourette, and Kenneth S. Latourette, is preceded by a brief biography of the missionary.

By act of June 3, 1915, the California legislature established an Historical Survey Commission of three members, whose duty is to make a systematic record of historical materials in county archives, in other local repositories, and in private hands. The work will be carried out, under direction of the commission, by Mr. Owen C. Coy.

The Academy of Pacific Coast History expects before long to issue, in two volumes, the papers of the First Vigilance Committee of San Francisco, 1851, edited by Miss Mary E. Williams. A later publication will be an Atlas of the Historical Geography of the Pacific Coast, from Lower California up, to be edited by Professor Frederick J. Teggart, and to consist mostly of reproductions of manuscript maps.

The Public Archives of Canada have received by transfer from the Department of Indian Affairs more than a ton of old records, and now

contain nearly all the records of that department prior to Confederation. They have also received five account-books of the American Fur Company at Michilimackinac, 1817-1834, and various original maps and papers relating to the Northeast Boundary. Besides transcripts from the archives and prévôté of Quebec and the Seminary of St. Sulpice at Montreal, volumes of transcripts from Europe continue to be received—from the Colonial Office, War Office, and Admiralty Papers at the Public Record Office, from the various manuscript sections of the British Museum, from the archives of the Hudson's Bay Company (journals of York, Albany, and Prince of Wales forts, 1726-1729), from the Shelburne manuscripts at Lansdowne House, from the Royal Institution, from the Archives des Affaires Étrangères (Corr. Pol., États-Unis, vols. 20, 21, 1782), Colonies, Marine, Guerre, and from the Bibliothèque Nationale. Plans have been made for an extension of the building which would treble its capacity, but their execution has been halted by the war.

The Champlain Society has lately issued, as its eleventh volume, a third volume of Messrs. W. L. Grant and H. P. Biggar's edition of Lescarbot.

The Macmillan Company has published in the series *English History Source Books, Canada*, compiled by Mr. James Munro.

Bulletin No. 12 of Queen's University, Kingston, Canada, entitled *Life of the Settler in Western Canada before the War of 1812*, by Dr. Adam Shortt, is the account of a New Jersey farmer who in 1794 settled on a farm in Canada and at once began a diary of his fortunes, which supplies the subject-matter for this book.

The Oxford University Press announces the speedy appearance of *Selkirk's Colony in Canada*, by Professor Chester Martin.

The Yale University Press will publish this autumn *Economic Development of the British West Indies, 1700-1760*, by Frank W. Pitman.

In the *Revue Historique* for July E. Martin-Chabot gives a general review of the publications of 1904-1914 relating to Latin American history.

The contents of the March-April number of the *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* (Cuba) include the *real cédula* establishing the Real Compañía Marítima (1749) and "Memoria Histórica-Estadística sobre los Bienes de ex-Regulares de Bayamo", by M. V. [Valle], administrator of *rentas* at Manzanillo, December, 1854.

Pioneers in Tropical America, by Sir Harry H. Johnston, has been issued by the Dodge Publishing Company.

Dr. Walter Lichtenstein, librarian of Northwestern University, having been engaged for nineteen or twenty months, in 1913-1914, in

travels in South America for the purchase of books for several American libraries, has printed in the *Bulletin* of his university an interesting account of his bibliographical journey, entitled *A Trip to South America*, embellished with photographs of rare title-pages. The result of the journey will be a large addition to the South American material at Harvard, in the John Carter Brown Library, in that of the American Antiquarian Society (newspapers), and at Northwestern University.

S. de Ispizua has published an essay on *Bibliografía Histórica Sudamericana* (Bilbao, Eléxpuru, 1914, pp. 19). The names Ci—F are included in the second volume of G. de Santiago Vela's *Ensayo de una Biblioteca Iberoamericana de la Orden de San Augustin* (Madrid, Asilo de Huérfanos, 1915, pp. 722).

The years 1536 to 1810 are covered in R. D. Carbia, *Historia Eclesiástica del Rio de la Plata* (Buenos Aires, Alfa y Omega, 1914, 2 vols.). In the series of *Documentos para la Historia Argentina*, the fourth volume contains *Abastos de la Ciudad y Campaña de Buenos Aires, 1773-1809* (Buenos Aires, 1914, pp. xv, 595).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. W. Jernegan, *The Beginnings of Public Education in New England* (School Review, May-June); F. G. Baldwin, *Early Architecture of the Valley of the Rappahannock* (Journal of the American Institute of Architects, several articles); W. S. Carpenter, *Repeal of the Judiciary Act of 1801* (American Political Science Review, August); G. N. Tricoche, *Le Siège de Nauvoo ou la Bataille des Maladroits, Épisode de l'Histoire des Mormons* (Revue Historique, July); Thomas Rowland, *Letters of a Virginia Cadet at West Point, 1859-1861* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); Gamaliel Bradford, *Edwin M. Stanton* (Atlantic Monthly, August); L. M. Sears, *French Opinions of our Civil War* (Mid-West Quarterly, July); D. K. Watson, *The Trial of Jefferson Davis; an Interesting Constitutional Question* (Yale Law Journal, June); W. R. Thayer, *Historical Writing: its Trend during the Years 1865-1915* (The Nation, July 8); *id.*, *The Close of John Hay's Career* (Harper's Monthly, August); *id.*, *John Hay's Years with Theodore Roosevelt* (*ibid.*, September); O. M. W. Sprague, *The Crisis of 1914 in the United States* (American Economic Review, September); L. Groulx, *Nos Luttes Constitutionnelles, 1791-1840: la Question des Subsidies* (Revue Canadienne, July); G. W. Bartlett, *The Diary of Robert Campbell, I., The Red River Settlement* (Canadian Magazine, August); George Bryce, *The Real Strathcona, II.* (*ibid.*).